



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

АН БНГВ V



period
188

יהוה



55-63
189 40
10 .8

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

AMERICAN BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

E. A. PARK AND S. H. TAYLOR, EDITORS,

AIDED BY

PROFESSORS ROBINSON, STOWE, BARROWS, SMITH, ALLEN, DAY,
PHELPS, SHEDD, BROWN, PUTNAM, AND DRS. DAVIDSON
OF ENGLAND AND ALEXANDER OF SCOTLAND.

VOL. XI.

ANDOVER:

WARREN F. DRAPER.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., 12, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1854.

**Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1854, by
WARREN F. DRAPER,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.**

CONTENTS OF VOL. XI.

NO. XLI

Article.	Page.
I. RHETORIC DETERMINED AND APPLIED,	1
By Laurens P. Hickok, D. D., Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.	
II. PHRENOLOGY,	19
By Enoch Pond, D. D., Professor in Bangor Theological Seminary. [Concluded from Vol. X. p. 672.]	
III. EXCURSION TO THE SUMMIT OF HERMON,	41
By Rev. J. L. Porter, Missionary at Damascus.	
IV. THE COMPARATIVE VALUE OF ENGLISH AND GERMAN BIBLICAL SCIENCE,	67
By Charles A. Aiken, Resident Licentiate, Andover.	
V. VIEWS OF TRUTH PECULIAR TO CHRISTIANITY,	87
By Seth Sweetser, D. D., Worcester, Mass.	
VI. THE SIMILARITY BETWEEN THE EPISTLE OF JUDE AND THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER,	114
By Rev. Frederic Gardiner, Bath, Maine.	
VII. MAN AND HIS FOOD,	139
By Leonard Withington, D. D., Newbury, Mass.	
VIII. THE TEMPTATION IN THE WILDERNESS,	155
By William A. Stearns, D. D., Cambridge, Mass.	
IX. THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF MICHIGAN,	167
By James R. Boise, M. A., Professor in the University of Michigan.	

X. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,	183
I. Dr. Hickok's Moral Science,	183
II. Dr. Beecher's Conflict of Ages,	186
III. Hengstenberg on the Lord's Day,	191
IV. Tischendorf's Apocryphal Gospels,	194
V. Venema's Theology,	195
VI. Memoirs of Horner,	198
VII. De Vere's Comparative Philology,	200
VIII. Prof. Tyler's editions of Tacitus,	204
IX. Pauly's Encyclopaedia of Classical Antiquities,	205

XI. SELECT THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTEL- LIGENCE,	206
Germany,	206
Great Britain,	211
United States,	213

NO. XLII

I. HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY AND ETHNOGRAPHY, 217

Translated from Rougemont's *Essai d'une Géographie de l'Homme*,
by E. C. Tracy, Windsor, Vt.

1. Man and Nature,	217
2. Man in his Idea,	221
3. Man Fallen,	222
4. Origin of Races,	225
5. Gradual Degeneration of Man and Nature,	226
6. Providential Movements in Ages immediately subsequent to the Deluge,	227
7. Location of Races,	230
8. The Shemites,	236
9. Japhethites,	239
10. Hamites,	244
11. The Nations as a Whole,	245
12. History,	246
13. Redemption,	249

II. GOD'S POSITIVE MORAL GOVERNMENT OVER MORAL AGENTS, ADDITIONAL TO THAT WHICH IS MERELY NATURAL, 254

By Rev. Samuel D. Cochrane, Paterson, N. J.

III. THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, AND THE REASONS FOR THEIR EXCLUSION FROM THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE, . . . 278

By C. E. Stowe, D. D., Professor at Andover.

- I. The Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament, . . . 278
- II. Debates and Decisions in the Council of Trent, . . . 280
- III. These Books never had the Sanction of Christ or of his Apostles, or of any of the Writers of the New Testament, . . . 292
- IV. These Books formed no part of the original Hebrew Canon, and were not written till after Inspiration had ceased and the Canon was closed, . . . 293
- V. These Books were rejected with singular unanimity by the Early Christian Churches and the best of the Church Fathers, . . . 295

IV. THE RELATION OF DAVID'S FAMILY TO THE MESSIAH . . . 306

By E. P. Barrows, Professor at Andover.

V. EXCURSION TO THE LAKES EAST OF DAMASCUS, 329

By Rev. J. L. Porter, Missionary at Damascus.

EXCURSION TO KESWEEH, . . . 342

VI. THE NATURE AND INFLUENCE OF THE HISTORIC SPIRIT, . . . 345

An Inaugural Discourse, by William G. T. Shedd, Professor at Andover.

VII. CHAUCER AND HIS TIMES, . . . 394

By M. P. Case, M. A., Newburyport, Mass.

VIII. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS, . . . 417

I. Dr. Cannon's Pastoral Theology, . . . 417

By Rev. C. Van Santvoord, Saugerties, N. Y.

IX. SELECT THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE, . . . 429

Great Britain, . . . 429

NO. XLIII

I. EXCURSION FROM DAMASCUS TO YABRUD, ETC.	433
By Rev. J. L. Porter, Missionary at Damascus.	
II. DRUIDISM,	456
By Rev. Edward D. Morris, Auburn, N. Y.	
III. CASTE IN THE ISLAND OF CEYLON,	470
By Rev. Benjamin C. Meigs, Rev. Daniel Poor, D. D., and Rev. William W. Holland, Missionaries of the A. B. C. F. M. in Ceylon.	
IV. CHRISTIAN CHARACTER A POWER IN THE REDEMPTION OF THE WORLD,	490
By Austin Phelps, Professor at Andover.	
V. DID PAUL MODEL HIS LANGUAGE AFTER THAT OF DEMOSTHENES?	514
Translated from the German of Dr. Friedrich Köster of Stade.	
VI. THE GENIUS OF HEBREW AND OF ROMAN LEARNING,	527
By P. B. Spear, Professor of the Hebrew and Latin Languages, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.	
I. Hebrew and Roman Learning treated Comparatively with the Greek,	528
II. Hebrew and Roman Learning treated Comparatively with each other,	547
VII. THE CITATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW,	568
Translated from the German of Tholuck, by Charles A. Aiken, Resident Licentiate, Andover.	
§ 1. Historical Introduction,	569
§ 2. The Citations of the Old Testament in Jewish Authors,	577
§ 3. Application of the Old Testament in the Discourses of Christ,	586
§ 4. The Application of the Old Testament by Paul,	594
§ 5. Application of the Old Testament by the Evangelists,	600
§ 6. Application of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews,	606

VIII. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,	616
I. Septem contra Thebas,	616
II. Ebrard on Hebrews, in continuation of Olshausen,	624
III. Alexander's Connection of the Old and New Testaments,	626
IV. Alexander's Christ and Christianity,	628
V. Barnes on Daniel,	629
VI. Professor Eadie on the Ephesians,	630
VII. Christ as made known to the Ancient Church,	631
VIII. Coleman's Historical Text-book and Atlas of Biblical Geography,	633
IX. Hughes's Outlines of Scripture Geography and History,	634
X. Chalybaeus's History of Philosophy,	635
XI. Schmitz's Advanced Latin Exercises,	636

IX. SELECT LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL INTEL- LIGENCE,	637
Greece,	637
Germany,	640
Great Britain,	643

NO. XLIV.

I. NOTES OF A TOUR FROM DAMASCUS TO BA'- ALBEK AND HUMS,	649
By Rev. J. L. Porter, Missionary at Damascus.	

II. OUR SAVIOUR'S DISCOURSE IN THE SYNAGOGUE AT CAPERNAUM,	693
By E. P. Barrows, Professor at Andover.	
I. Our Lord's Person and Office in their Relation to the Believer,	694
II. Exposition of the Discourse,	709

III. ANSELM'S DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION AND ATONEMENT,	729
A TRANSLATION OF THE "CUR DEUS HOMO."	
By James Gardiner Vose, Milton, Mass.	

IV. SPECIAL DIVINE INTERPOSITIONS IN NATURE,	776
By Edward Hitchcock, D. D., LL. D., Amherst College.	
V. PAGANIZED ECCLESIASTICISM, THE CHIEF AN- TAGONIST OF THE MODERN MISSIONARY,	801
By Rev. Joseph P. Thompson, New York.	
VI. NOTES UPON THE GEOGRAPHY OF MACEDONIA,	830
By Rev. Edward M. Dodd.	
VII. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,	836
I. Comparative Philology,	836
II. Alford's Greek Testament, Vol. I. Second edition, .	839
III. Benecke on Romans,	841
IV. Tholuck's Sin and the Propitiator,	842
V. Dr. John Pye Smith's Theology,	842
VI. Turnbull's Christ in History,	843
VII. Bolton's Evidences of Christianity,	844
VIII. Hoppin's Notes,	844
IX. Thompson's Egypt,	845
X. The Spirit's Sword,	845
XI. Memoir of Rev. Oliver A. Taylor,	846
XII. Brown's History of Missions,	847
XIII. Hugh Miller,	848
VIII. SELECT THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTEL- LIGENCE,	849
Germany,	849
France,	851
England,	852
Scotland,	854
United States,	856
INDEX,	860

CONTENTS OF NO. XLI.

Article.	Page.
I. RHETORIC DETERMINED AND APPLIED,	1
By Laurens P. Hickok, D. D., Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.	
II. PHRENOLOGY,	19
By Enoch Pond, D. D., Professor in Bangor Theological Seminary. [Concluded from Vol. X. p. 672.]	
III. EXCURSION TO THE SUMMIT OF HERMON,	41
By Rev. J. L. Porter, Missionary at Damascus.	
IV. THE COMPARATIVE VALUE OF ENGLISH AND GERMAN BIBLICAL SCIENCE,	67
By Charles A. Aiken, Resident Licentiate, Andover.	
V. VIEWS OF TRUTH PECULIAR TO CHRISTIANITY,	87
By Seth Sweetser, D. D., Worcester, Mass.	

VI. THE SIMILARITY BETWEEN THE EPISTLE OF JUDE AND THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER, . . .	114
By Rev. Frederic Gardiner, Bath, Maine.	
VII. MAN AND HIS FOOD,	139
By Leonard Withington, D. D., Newbury, Mass.	
VIII. THE TEMPTATION IN THE WILDERNESS, . . .	155
By William A. Stearns, D. D., Cambridge, Mass.	
IX. THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF MICHIGAN, . . .	167
By James R. Boise, M. A., Professor in the University of Michigan.	
X. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,	183
I. Dr. Hickok's Moral Science,	183
II. Dr. Beecher's Conflict of Ages,	186
III. Hengstenberg on the Lord's Day,	191
IV. Tischendorf's Apocryphal Gospels,	194
V. Venema's Theology,	195
VI. Memoirs of Horner,	198
VII. De Vere's Comparative Philology,	200
VIII. Prof. Tyler's editions of Tacitus,	204
IX. Pauly's Encyclopaedia of Classical Antiquities,	205
IX. SELECT THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE, 206	
Germany,	206
Great Britain,	211
United States,	213

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA,
NO. XLI.
AND
AMERICAN BIBLICAL REPOSITORY,
NO. XCIII.

JANUARY, 1854.

ARTICLE I.

RHETORIC DETERMINED AND APPLIED.¹

By Laurens P. Hickok, D. D., Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

An orator has ceased speaking. The audience are just recovering themselves from the spell in which for hours they have been bound, and are now slowly and thoughtfully passing away from the place of concourse. Every countenance expresses the power which the speaker has had over the emotions of the soul, for the whole retiring audience carry away the impress given by his eloquence.

Here, then, is just the point for the philosophic observer coolly to take in the whole scene, and determine that which is the radical peculiarity in it. Within a few hours, at the most, all this effect has been produced. This mass of mind came together various and isolate; it has gone away assimilated and fused into one. Every mind knows that its whole transformation during this period has been by the power of eloquence, and yet probably few of that audience can say precisely what that wonderful power is. It is not many things, but one thing; not a composite, but a simple. Like the force which unites nature, it is one, though everywhere diffused; like the life of the body, it ener-

¹ This Article was originally delivered as an Oration before the Porter Rhetorical Society of Andover Theological Seminary, Sept. 6, 1853.

gizes in every part and yet is everywhere a unit. What is it? How shall we attain it and express it?

The theme which we propose in this Article is: RHETORIC DETERMINED AND APPLIED; and the first part of the design demands a direct answer to these inquiries. It must be determined, *What is that simple force which is the whole life of eloquence?* The way to the answer lies through a careful analysis, and we have no choice but to attempt leading you by that path, even though it shall prove somewhat arduous and dry.

There has manifestly been the presence of *pure logic*. Every judgment has had its logical form, and has been attained according to a necessary and universal law which must regulate all thinking. No mind can connect its conceptions into propositions in an arbitrary manner. All intelligence has its conditioning law, and mind must think, if it think at all, according to fixed processes of concluding in judgments. It cannot conceive of phenomena but in spaces and times; it cannot combine qualities but in their substances, nor connect events but in their causes. Thinking is what it is, and not feeling nor willing, not walking nor eating, in virtue of the necessary forms which determine it. Quite irrespective of the thought itself, as a judgment formed, there must be the antecedent pure form which conditioned it in its connections and conclusions.

But all thinking is not in one order. Conceptions are connected in various ways and come out to their own peculiar conclusions. We may call these judgments analytic and synthetic, and distinguish the different connections of the predicates and subjects in their copulas as categorical, hypothetical and disjunctive; but no matter what the thought, there is a determinate number of pure forms, in one of which it must come out as a judgment, if the mind makes any conclusion at all about it. Such pure forms as conditioning all thought, and thus themselves prior to the thought, give occasion for a *pure logic*, which must be necessary for all thinking.

But has this pure logic done the work in this wonderful transformation? Has any form of thinking been the soul of this eloquence? Manifestly not. For when we look carefully at the logic, we see that it has had a master. It has been *used*. The power is not in it; there has been a power over it, making it to do another's bidding. One form of thinking fits a particular end rather than another, and the logic we find has all along been

used with the nicest adaptation. The logician can go over the whole ground, and take up every pure form of thought, and put it at once into its own category in logical science, and may thus give in detail the entire logical construction precisely according to the logical facts. But this determination of logical fact will, by no means, determine the rhetorical reason. The mere logician cannot say why this form of a judgment was put here and another there. And yet any one can see that the logic has been *used*. Make any change in the form of thinking in its place, and the eloquence of that place at once vanishes. The logic is not the eloquence, it has been only the servant of eloquence. A higher power has had dominion over it.

There has also been *pure grammar*. Every thought has had its own verbal expression, and every judgment its grammatical construction, according to previous necessary rules of speech. Thought cannot make its arbitrary modes of expression; language is its dress, and it must be put on in a determinate manner. From the inner nature of thought, it must clothe itself in speech after necessary and universal forms.

Thought is a purely spiritual essence. In whatever logical form, it still has no significancy but in the hidden consciousness of the thinker. That it may be of any outer signification, it must take on a body and reveal itself in some external expression. But this mode of expression is determined for it in the logical form of the thinking itself. A hypothetical judgment cannot express itself categorically, nor a categorical judgment express itself disjunctively. No matter what the symbol for the thought, its connections of agent and object, time and number, relative and antecedent, etc. must necessarily and universally determine its mode of expression, and thus all language which expresses thought must have the same necessary rules. No peculiarities of any language can take it out of the universal laws for all language. There is an occasion for a pure universal grammar.

But has this grammatical arrangement of speech done this marvellous work? Again, and for the same reason, we say, manifestly not. The whole grammatical expression has itself been controlled. The fixed rules of universal grammar have all along been observed, but all those modifications, which elegance, force, clearness and facility of apprehension admit, have been freely used. A power back of the grammarian has been perpetually at work, making its selection of terms, arrangement of sen-

tences, modulation of whole paragraphs, and even building up the entire oration from beginning to end, without any consultation with or regard to him. An end has been sought which, from the position of the grammarian, could not have appeared in his whole horizon. That particular sentence would have parsed as well in some other mode of expression, and that whole paragraph might have had another mode of construction equally grammatical; but if you should change either, the eloquence would at once evaporate. The grammar is not the eloquence, but the eloquence has thrown its living power into the grammar and made it to take on such forms of expression as its own high design had determined for it.

Again, there has been *complete discourse*. The thought of the speaker has been put into language, and, as thus standing out in its symbol, the audience have come to it and taken the thought from it. There has thus been a communication between the consciousness of the speaker and the separate consciousness of each hearer. The thought of the orator has been made common to him and his audience. He has gone to his form of expression and put his thought there, and they have come to this form of expression and taken the thought away with them, and thus by this *discursus* through the common symbol, a complete discourse has been effected.

But mere discourse, though complete discourse, rests solely on logic and grammar. Logical thought in grammatical expression is all that the most perfect discourse requires. When the thinker has grammatically expressed his thought, and the receiver has come to this expression and taken the thought, the discourse is complete and the whole work consummated. An algebraical nomenclature, or a cartouch of hieroglyphics give occasion for complete discourse. But surely this communication from the orator to his spell-bound audience has not been mere discourse. He has not merely hung up his dry thoughts in his grammatical sentences, and the audience come there and taken them out as so many separate bones of a skeleton. Every thought, as they have received it, has gone into their souls glowing with the orator's life and spirit. His soul as well as his intellect has been transferred to them.

There has, then, been *direct address*. The orator did not make his thought his end, nor the expression of that thought in grammatical language; he had his audience directly in his eye. His whole aim was to hit them.

A man may soliloquize, or use speech merely as a repository of his thought, and in such outer expression he has no design to put his thought over into other minds. Another mind might casually find the expressive symbol and take the thought from it, and it would thus become complete discourse; but the author of this speech had no design to communicate, and no regard to any other mind when he made it, and thus no sympathy of his mind with others can be got out of it, nor can any warmth of the author's intention be imparted by it. No matter what thought the expression may embody, nor how much emotion the language may describe, the author had no regard to any other mind in his speech, and though it may be very expressive speech, it cannot be eloquent speech.

The orator had other minds directly in view; he put his thought into speech with the intention that it should pass most readily, through the expressions, out of his mind into theirs. He *directly addressed* them. The very intention to communicate involved regard to the end he would attain by the communication; regard to the peculiarities of the audience; and regard to the place and circumstances where the communication was made. His intention was to lodge his thought the most directly and effectually in their minds, and he must have had regard to all these peculiarities through the whole speech, and so have used everything in it that his thought might go over through it with the greatest facility. This determined the logical form of the thinking, the grammatical mode of expression, the whole arrangement of the language through which he meant his thought should flow over out of his mind into theirs. It determined also his whole manner, his tone and emphasis, his attitude and gesture, the look of the eye and the expression of the countenance. He used everything for this grand purpose, that he might put over what was in his whole mind, of thought and emotion, and will into theirs the most easily and completely.

This is ADDRESS — *discourse modified by the speaker's intention to communicate*. A living principle runs through it, and makes the whole quick and powerful. Every word is spirit and life. One force has created the whole product. Invention, arrangement, composition, elocution, the entire action, have all grown out of one spirit and come up into one life. The living intention of the speaker to throw what was within himself into them, has vitalized the whole process, and, as great thoughts and glowing

emotions went successively over, this has kept up the vital connection, and the whole has gone as a quickening power into them, assimilating each to each and all to the orator.

And now this, we say, is the life and the soul of eloquence — *the intention* that takes the thought, forms it, clothes it, and directly addresses it to the minds of others. This intention uses logic and grammar, symbol and style, tone and gesture, for its own purpose and at its own pleasure, and makes all the difference there is between a dry deposit of thought in the coldest symbols, and that eloquent speech in which the thoughts breathe and the words burn. Eloquence is *living address*; speech glowing with the quickening intention of the speaker. The fervor of the eloquence will be proportioned to the glowing thought and ardent emotion to be communicated, but the intention to communicate will always give the proper tone to the eloquence which the theme demands. In this is its whole life and power.

And now, this living intention in address, acting itself out and pouring itself into the consciousness of others, which is eloquence, may be made the subject of observation in *three ways*. We may study the laws by which this intention to communicate can be best effected, solely that we may *know* them, and in this we shall have *science*; or, for the purpose of applying them to any particular example that we may *estimate it*, and in this we shall have a *critique*; or, for the purpose of *teaching and discipline*, and in this we shall have *art*.

This observing and studying eloquence as a subject is *rhetoric*; and thus rhetoric admits of its being considered as a science, a critique or an art. The precise field of rhetoric is thus definitely circumscribed. It covers all that province over which the living intention in address may traverse.

We thus determine what rhetoric is, and the definite field which it occupies, but this determination will be more *completely effected* if we show the exclusion of some things not seldom confounded with it.

It excludes *philosophy*. The speech of the philosopher, as such, is not address. He studies his forms of expression only to give clearness and fulness to his thought. His system or treatise is solely an offshoot from his own intellect, without regard to any peculiarities in others. He does not shape and address it to minds, he matures and elaborates it *from* his own, and then hangs it up high and dry for any who will to study and attain.

There is no shaping it as if easily to *insert*, but the speech is used solely that it may completely *express* the thought. Thus philosophy gives no occasion for eloquence.

It excludes *poetry*. The poet studies expression only to disclose his own emotion. He *makes* his speech from the overflowings of his own soul. He has no regard to others, and is solicitous only to find vent for what is within himself. His fire would immediately be smothered and die, if he must be studying the peculiarities of other minds to see how he could kindle their emotions. Sufficient to him that he makes his own come out and then let any who participate in the common humanity come to his verse and appreciate it as they may. If the overflowings of his own soul do not move men, the poet has no power over them. He never tries to move by eloquence. An eloquent poet and a poetic orator, each alike manifests an insufferable impertinence.

It also excludes all *fine art*. In music, painting, and sculpture, the effort of the artist is to give expression to his own sentiment. His ideal, which is the creation of his own genius, is within him, and his task is to put its expressive form upon some outer material. He does not address any mind, he solely embodies the product of his own. He thinks nothing of implanting, but only of representing. We may talk of his "expressive canvas," or his "speaking marble," or his "touching tones" of melody and harmony; but all this means only that the embodied ideal of the artist greatly moves us, and not that we discern any indication that he turned his mind's eye aside for a moment from the work of expressing his inward creation, to the reading of our minds and studying how he might lodge it within our consciousness. He studies nature, not any observers or auditors. He will not look off from nature to us in order to find what we may think we want, and then shape his product to fit our prejudices, or easily adapt itself to the apprehension of our less cultivated taste and less experienced imagination. He seeks to satisfy himself, not us; if we cannot come and take his work just as it is, and read his grand idea in it, this may be very much our misfortune, but it is none of his care.

But the carefulness of the orator is seen in precisely that point where the artist excludes it. His work is not merely to get out his thought, but by all means to get it over into the minds of his hearers. He closely studies them, and adapts his whole work

to them. He accomplishes nothing as an orator if he does **not** transfer his conceptions into their minds. Thought and emotion merely as expression, as embodied and represented for show, **is** nothing to him; if his sentiment does not easily flow into their souls, and his fire burn also in their bosoms, he cannot be satisfied.

Thus it is that philosophy *expresses truth*, fine art *expresses sentiment*, but eloquence *transfers both*. All may be discourse, as communication through a common symbol from mind to mind, but science and art have no intention so to shape as to transfer, while the whole life of eloquence is solely in that intention. The philosophy, the poem, the painting, the statue, the tune, may all stand out in their expression solitary and alone, but the oration will always have both the speaker and the hearers within it.

We may also add, that, though eloquence does *not exclude*, it strongly *reluctates all reading*. The reader may *address* an audience. He may labor with the deep intention to transfer the thought of his embodied speech into their minds, and infuse its whole expressed emotions into their hearts, and this will give to his tones and emphasis, his look and gesture something of the semblance of eloquence. But in the best reading we always distinguish at once between it and eloquent speaking. The form of thinking and mode of expressing are already made up for the reader, and his intention to transfer finds both logic and language already stubborn facts which he can no more alter. He must adapt himself to them, and cannot now adapt them to any peculiarity which his address may demand. The powers of invention, arrangement and composition are shut up; everything here is finished, and must be taken as it is; and the whole movement of the reader betrays everywhere this want of freedom. He cannot read with the natural ease that everywhere appears in his talk. Good reading is not like good speaking. The reader must take the form of thinking and of expression as they are already given and conform himself to them, and not as the speaker does, freely make them conform to him; and this trammel of the logic and grammar will also cramp and hamper every other activity. His elocution and oratorical action will all be constrained and modified by it.

There may be other compensating advantages to the reader, and such as may make it expedient that his address should be

that of precomposed speech, but these advantages will not be in the rhetoric. The constraint will be less after much familiarity with the composition, and least of all when the speech is the reader's own, because he can then adapt himself to its thinking and expression the most readily; but still the order of the adaptation is inverted; he is fitting himself to his speech, not fitting his speech by his intention. That embodied speech is the most natural possible, where the author has composed it for the occasion and the audience, and thus with the intention that it *shall* be transferred at a future hour; yet when this shall be flowing over from speaker to hearer pretty completely and even interestingly, it can still only be eloquent reading, and not the free grace and ease of eloquent speaking. In perfect eloquence, the intention to transfer the speaker's soul to his hearers must work unconstrained through all the process, and modulate itself as unconsciously and spontaneously in thought and word as in tone and look.

The field of rhetoric as art, in which must be the culture of eloquence, has thus been both definitely and exclusively *determined*. We have still before us the remaining portion of our design in rhetoric *applied*.

The orator's intention to transfer will be greatly modified by that which is to be transferred. Such intention will always modify thought and speech, elocution and action, and will thus always give eloquence; but the thought and sentiment will also react upon the intention, and so modify it, that the eloquence induced will be necessarily very various. We shall find this application of the intention in address to be so affected by the matter which it carries over, that it may vitiate the whole activity and make it to be only a spurious and forbidden eloquence; and of such as is legitimate and genuine we shall find that the order of application gives entirely distinct species of eloquence. Rhetoric, thus, has as deep an interest in a true application as in an exact determination.

We can come to the intelligent apprehension of rhetoric *applied* only as before through an analysis; but if in many respects quite as profound, yet may the process be made shorter than the former, and will to most minds pass through a region of more intrinsic interest.

A philosophical treatise is but the repository of the philosopher's thinking and conclusions, and thus as knowing no audience

has no eloquence. But the philosopher may take the attitude of a teacher, and use speech as address, that he may instruct and convince, and, so far as this intention to transfer his conclusions to others modifies his discourse, so far there will be eloquence. In this way Plato has many passages truly eloquent. But such eloquence is ever calm and unimpassioned. It uses no ornament but for illustration, and deals only with the intellect. It may be an essential part of the most impassioned address, but only as conviction is made the basis for earnest persuasion. The application of the orator's intention is, however, to some higher point than instruction and conviction, and designed to move to action; but this not as the result of authority, and only through freedom. The orator is not in the place of sovereignty to command, and ordinarily not merely in the place of the teacher to instruct, but, as man with man on common ground, to excite and persuade. His communications must be adapted to reach and excite those common susceptibilities of human nature which prompt to action. His intention in address must thus apply itself to the *practical susceptibilities* of mankind. This is the great field for *applied rhetoric*, viz. the human susceptibilities which prompt to action. In this field we are to follow out our analysis and find the legitimate and the discriminated application of rhetoric.

Man's *animal nature* has many craving desires and wants, which may be summarily comprehended under the one name of appetites. These are common to man and the brute, and the difference of *degree* in man makes no distinction in *kind*. These appetites may be reached in man by speech, and so addressed and excited as to move powerfully, though impulsively, to action. A speaker may make his whole appeal to these constitutional appetites, and present such conceptions as shall stimulate them the most intensely. One man may be regardless of any other consideration than simply to gain his own end, and use any appetite that will bring others into his designs the most surely. In doing this he may be eloquent, but the rhetoric which should teach such eloquence would be immoral, and properly characterized as a satanic rhetoric. Another man might refrain from the more gross, and appeal only to the more select and refined appetites, the natural sympathies and sentimental feelings of mankind. But this would still be an application of the intention disallowed and reprehensible. Eloquence has no license to apply itself to the appetites or natural sympathies which are

common to man and the brute. Such application, even to the more select wants and sympathies, degrades the orator and debases his hearers.

Viewed only in a rhetorical and not in an ethical light, it is a spurious eloquence. It ultimately defeats its own end and subverts its own interests, for no man will approve of himself for yielding to it, nor respect the speaker who used it. He may delude once, but he becomes a noted man after that, and is distrusted and avoided by even bad men. So the old rhetoricians and sophists, who taught how to gain any end by speech, ultimately became powerless and run their own art into the ground. When eloquence has been suspected and condemned, it has always been in this view of its application, and it is worthy of condemnation always in such a mode of its application. No genuine orator has any business with the animal feelings and sympathies of humanity. If he does not rise higher in the application of his address, he is only leading men as the cattle are led, and thus brutalizing them and degrading himself. No rhetorician may go to the animal nature of man for his topics, and no orator apply his address to appetitive wants and sympathies.

Experience, in all these animal appetites, may have given occasion for deducing *general rules from general consequences*. As things are, such and such a course has been found attended by its own happy or unhappy results, and thus a rule of *highest happiness* has been attained. As men carry out their individual choices into execution, it has been found that one interferes with those of others, and "the sovereignty of the individual" must be restrained for the freedom of the whole by the sovereignty of the whole, and the rule of *public liberty* has been thus attained. Such and such a course of national polity has been found to subserve the highest productive, mercantile and commercial prosperity, and thus the rules of *political economy* have been found. These general rules, controlling and restraining individual appetite, give to us the higher practical principles of utility, prudence, liberty, economy, etc., and thus an opportunity to apply address to the matured judgments of mankind, and not to their particular appetites and sympathies.

As the expedient and the prudent, there is here a legitimate application of the speaker's intention. He may thus appeal to the judgments of men in the interests of public utility and liberty. He can thus touch no cords of *moral* conviction and obli-

gation, but he can lead men, by the judgment of what is the greatest happiness of the greatest number, to exclude much suffering and secure much enjoyment. Here is the broad field for all *secular* rhetoric, teaching the eloquence of the bar, the senate and the forum, in reference to the legal rights of property, liberty and public prosperity.

But man knows himself as more than *animal*; and more than appetitive interest *generalized into the expedient and prudent*; even as existing in a *rational spiritual personality*. In clearly knowing *himself*, he knows that the appetites of the flesh should be subjected to the imperatives of the spirit, and that "the law in the members" must be held in subjection to "the law of the mind." As "the spirit of a man knoweth the things of a man," so man comes to know intuitively in himself what is due to himself, and therefore what will debase and what will dignify himself. In this, and in this only, he has "a law written on his heart," and "a conscience accusing or excusing." Here is the point where he transcends the animal in *kind*, and not *degree* alone, and rises to the moral personality. He has a spring from this imperative within, to hold himself steady against all the clamors of natural appetite without the spirit, and thus the capability and the obligation "to keep his body under and bring it into subjection" to this higher dignity of the spirit. Here alone is man's prerogative of freedom and moral accountability.

Thrown into society with other spiritual beings, he finds at once a higher law than prudence and greatest happiness, even an inner behest that he should act for his highest worthiness. He knows that it is far more to him to *be* good than to *get* good, and that he should hold what makes him and his fellows happy, wholly subservient to that which shall make him and them holy. He has a law above happiness, determining for him when only he may be happy; a law above prudence, determining for him when prudence itself is duty; a law above kindness, determining for him when even his benevolence is right. Here originate the grand ethical ideas of the good, the just, the right; imperatives awakened at once in the view of spiritual dignity and excellency, and revealing how terribly debased the man has become, who has sold the immortal freedom of this spirit in bondage to the flesh. Here is no generalization from experience and deducing general laws because experience is so, but here is a higher position disclosing how experience itself *ought to be*.

These grand moral ideas are for the speaker to apply in his address, and he rises at once from the field of secular into the sphere of *moral* eloquence. When at the bar, or in the halls of legislation, we have been listening to the eloquence which rests its appeals upon utility, and has rung the changes upon security of property, and popular rights, and public liberty, until all interest is worn to weariness; how, like the voice of a trumpet, does it rouse every soul, when some great statesman rises and takes us back to those original foundations on which all political rights of property and happiness and liberty repose! How, on every side, are kindled the deep convictions of inalienable responsibility, as this eloquence rises into the morally sublime in applying these grand ideas of immutable morality, and lets us see that all political right is but an empty name, if it does not stand upon the eternal basis of justice, and that all laws are tyranny, and all constitutions but usurpation, if they are not righteous!

But still, even deeper than the wants of man's ethical being, there is the conviction of dependence and helplessness which leads him out necessarily to feel the want of an absolute protector. The soul cries out for God, and cannot rest without a Deity to trust, to worship and adore. He is formed to be a *religious* being, and he can no more stifle these religious, than he can his ethical, susceptibilities. His spirit must find some presence within which he uncovers himself with awe, and where he bows with reverence, or he knows he has fallen from his proper sphere and is wandering as a lost and wretched outcast. His consciousness of sin gives consciousness of condemnation, and hence come all the wants of pardon and redemption. Thus, here come out all the great religious truths of God, a Mediator, an atonement, a gracious justification, and a heavenly mansion prepared by a Saviour. Revelation fully discloses all these great truths which the fallen soul is asking for, and a Divine agency applies these truths to sanctify where this fallen soul feels its helplessness, and thus a broad field of truth and motive is laid open, which is to be preached to every creature. Here is the field of *sacred* eloquence.

The pulpit has nothing to do with the secular interests of an audience; and, though it may introduce the grand ideas of ethical right, and show their harmony with revealed duty, yet is its address bound by its very position, as well as by the commission given by the Master, to "know nothing else but Jesus Christ

and him crucified." Man's religious nature cannot come out acceptably to God, in his fallen condition, except through God's appointed mediation. The sacred orator can thus be only the Gospel preacher. In his intention as address, there can be allowed to him to apply only Gospel themes, and all his eloquence must be exhausted in getting over evangelical truth from his own consciousness into the consciousness of those that hear him.

Sacred rhetoric has thus the teaching of eloquence in the highest sphere of applying address. It deals with themes which are the wonder of angels, and to be the eternal study of glorified saints. It gives more power to the pulpit over the practicable susceptibilities of man than the bar, the senate or the forum. Its themes will keep their hold upon public attention and interest when all others are worn out. The love of Christ will still constrain, when wealth and patriotism and freedom, and even pure morality fail to move.

With this apprehension of rhetoric as both determined and applied, we will close by alluding concisely to some of its *results, when thus faithfully used*. Both because it is of the highest kind of eloquence, and also from the place and occasion, it will be appropriate to confine our attention to the pulpit, and look at some of the results secured to the preacher by an exact rhetoric as we have now determined it.

This intention in applying appropriate truth as address, gives a principle which will run through the whole system of rhetoric and bind up all its parts in order. The art of rhetoric will rest on exact science. The law for transferred thought in address will expound every rhetorical rule, and control in the whole rhetorical culture and discipline. This will be for the rhetorical teacher fully to explain and use, but we may here very cursorily indicate what some of its prominent results must be to the preacher.

1. It will secure that the preacher always have a *distinct aim*. Eloquence is always a means and not an end. The orator is altogether absurd, if he makes himself to be eloquent solely for eloquence's sake. His work is to transfer thought and sentiment from his own mind to others, but this for a distinct design. As its very first condition, rhetoric sternly demands a definite end to be reached in this intention to communicate thought. The intent in addressing can possibly have no steadiness and persist-

ency, except as it reaches on and takes hold of some fixed object to be attained by it. Why labor so completely and clearly to implant your sentiment in another mind, if nothing is to be gained by it?

The very first thing which a determined rhetoric demands of the preacher is, that he propose some definite object to be gained in every address he makes. What absurdity to be eloquently giving over truth to an audience, and yet mean nothing by it! Intent in transferring, with no intensity of purpose to execute any result thereby! The hope to do good in general by preaching, and yet not to aim at some specific good in every sermon, is a solecism. A rhetoric truly determined will effectually exclude all the vague and pointless harangues, which so often usurp the name and the place, and waste the sacred time of a Gospel sermon.

2. The preacher will thus always have *thought*. How ridiculous, in the light of a true rhetoric, to be gravely and laboriously intent on putting over something into other waiting minds, and yet have absolutely nothing in your own to transfer! The object to be attained first having been fixed, the next thing is to get the right truth to reach it. Nothing at all can be accomplished by the most eloquent speaker, if he have only mere words and gesture. The thought must put itself into words, and the intention to lodge it in the hearer's mind must prompt every gesture, or the whole rhetorical action becomes a mere dumb-show. Words are but the dress of thought; and how idle to spend the time in setting forth costly clothes, when there is no living body and limbs to put into them! The speaker has not any possible use for words until he has first got thoughts, and the fitting words can only come, as the energy of the struggling thought prompts them. If the living, quickening idea does not go over into the hearer's mind, the whole time and labor are spent to no purpose. The mere passing of empty buckets from hand to hand must be a very profitless and tedious employment, hardly worth the effort to seek doing the thing elegantly.

A true rhetoric will not let the speaker open his mouth until he has been deeply thinking. It strikes dumb all mere prating, ranting, empty declaiming; and only opens the sacred desk to such as have a mind rich in Bible truth, and a heart warm with evangelic emotions. The word of God must be in the preacher as in the old prophet, "a burning fire shut up in the bones, so

wearying with all refraining that he cannot stay." It may be only thus "from the abundance of the heart that his mouth speaketh."

3. The preacher will always have *unity*. Many sermons are manifestly built up from the outside. The rubbish is cleared away and a foundation prepared, the materials are collected and shaped, the framework is put up by the application of plumb-line and measuring-rule, and thought after thought is spliced on or framed in with tenon and mortise, and the whole is finished according to the model given, or by following out consecutively the arbitrary directions. There is a very common view of rhetoric which so teaches to make sermons, and which is doubtless some better than to throw the raw materials into a promiscuous heap together. A mechanical unity is attained, and the application of square and compass perhaps detects no deficiencies nor redundances. The sermon is quite according to rule, but is wholly a mechanical product, and may be taken to pieces and its parts framed into any other sermons again at pleasure.

But the rhetoric here determined gives a very different process and secures a very different unity in the result. The sermon *grows* into shape. The intention in the address has singleness of aim and adaptedness of thought, and works in and through the whole to one issue. One life originates and develops the whole product. One germ with all its rudimental elements grows up to maturity, under the control of an inner law which determines what its form must be and when its growth must stop. There will be a vital unity. You might as well seek to take the life out of one plant and make it to develop itself anew in another, as to make a proper rhetorical life develop itself dividedly. Its working is all from the inside, and the vital force perpetually energizes in the living intention, and makes thought and word, plan and style, voice and look and act, all to come out completely, and all to stand together in symmetry. The sermon is one, and the delivery is one with it.

4. The preacher will always be *earnest*. When any mind has its clear plan, which is a distinct end and a plain way to get it, it works at once spontaneously and joyously. But of all employments, the work of putting over thoughts and sentiments from one mind into others, is the most intensely stimulating. Let a determined rhetoric prevail with the speaker, and he can be no other than a sincerely ardent and earnest man. He has his end

clearly in view, and that end is one in which judgment and feeling, conscience and reason, all harmonize. He has got his truth for the time and the place, for the people and the duty he would bring them to fulfil, and his way to the issue is to throw his own convictions and emotions in this truth, with the truth itself, over into their souls. In this position he cannot be a dull and dry speaker. His rhetorical life becomes one with his natural life and his Christian life, and all glow and burn within him. The action of his thought on the audience, and the reaction of their kindling interest in his theme, and the soul conscious of the teeming thoughts and emotions yet to come, and panting to attain the good end at which he is constantly looking, it will be impossible to check the growing enthusiasm. The man, the Christian, and the orator within him, all combine to make him earnest.

5. The preacher will always be *natural*. He is controlled by his own intention in his address, and the earnestness with which he puts over his thoughts to gain his end gives him no opportunity to borrow; no leisure to look about for models to imitate; no interest in any work of self-criticizing, to see if he is coming up to some ideal standard in his own imagination. He is intent and absorbed in the one work of transfusing his deep convictions and emotions through the audience, and he cares nothing about himself, thinks nothing about himself, but works spontaneously, earnestly, naturally, right onward to his issue. The logic and language, the style and elocution, are all prompted from the native impulses within him, and there can be no affectations, no awkward constraints, no conceited blandishments of style and manner, no tricks of voice or look or "start theatric," as the clap-trap expedients to catch applause and force himself into popular notoriety. His one end has but one way to it, and he goes on right manfully and earnestly, and thus naturally, till he reaches it.

6. The preacher is always *appropriate*. The place and the people, the occasion and the circumstances have all been consulted in the fixing of his aim and the selection of his theme, and the intention to give his thought over to his audience, spontaneously shapes all his speech and its delivery directly to the end in view. His whole address is to the thing in hand, and, in his earnestness to reach it, he will be impatient of all superfluous and impertinent matter. He will want nothing that is not appro-

priate and auxiliary to his main design. He has no good sayings laid by, which he can turn aside to bring in; no bright thoughts and fine figures kept in store, that he ostentatiously patches on to his sermon; but his mind is so intent on his main end, and so absorbed in the work, that, spontaneously, the most fitting words and expressions come up into use; the most apt tones and gestures suggest themselves; and he employs them all naturally, gracefully, and thus appropriately. His whole address is a living production, taking in and assimilating all that is congenial, and casting out and sloughing off all that is dead and cumbrous.

In closing, we add, that such a preacher will always be *effective*. God may in sovereignty send his Spirit where he will, and bless the preaching which is not, in any eminent sense, eloquent. But, usually, the special influences of the Spirit follow the most direct and earnest preaching. The eloquence, which the above determined and applied rhetoric teaches, is directly adapted to the nature of the human mind. It conforms to all the conditions of free intelligent agency, and runs directly in the lines prescribed for associated interest and sympathy. It has a power of its own, and, so long as the human spirit is true to its own laws of feeling and action, it must recognize the force of a living intention which quickens and energizes the address that is made to it. The glowing thoughts in burning words which come full from the ardent soul of one man, and pour themselves into the kindling minds of other men, must greatly move and interest them. And especially those Divine words which the preacher utters, that "are spirit and life," must take hold upon the sensibilities of sinful men. Those great truths of pardon, redemption, justification, and final glory, cannot reach the consciences of depraved and condemned men, in the power of this eloquence, without at least arousing and alarming them. Man's moral nature, though fallen, answers directly back to such appeals, and even stupidity is startled, and carnal security is made to be afraid. The preacher discharges his conscience in thus fulfilling his commission; the guilty are alarmed; and we may confidently pray and expect, that God will effectually work by his own Spirit, and "give the increase."

ARTICLE II.

PHRENOLOGY.

By Enoch Pond, D. D., Professor in Bangor Theological Seminary.

[Concluded from Vol. X. p. 672.]

ALTHOUGH we have done with the five fundamental principles of phrenology, we have still some additional objections and remarks, to which we would invite the attention of our readers.

First of all, we object to *the name* of this alleged science. It should never have been called *phrenology*. It should rather have retained the name which Dr. Gall first gave to it, *craniology*. Phrenology is the science of mind; whereas this is primarily the science of skulls. To be sure, it treats of the mind more or less; but only of the mind as manifested through the brain and skull. The brain is, in the strictest sense, the organ of the mind; and the size of the brain, as indicated by the size and shape of the skull, is the measure of the mind's power. The brain consists of a congeries of organs, whose base is indicated on the outer surface of the skull; each of these organs has a corresponding mental faculty, which operates by it, and through it. In proportion to the size of the organ, as indicated on the skull, is the strength and vigor of its corresponding faculty; hence, by an examination of the skull, the mental traits of the subject may be discovered. Such are the acknowledged principles of the science; and who does not see that it is rather *craniology*, than *phrenology*? It does not begin with the mind, ascertain its phenomena and faculties, and from these reason outward to the skull; but it begins with the skull — its size, its shape, its indentations, and bumps; from which it infers the size and shape of the brain; and from this the faculties and character of the mind. It is primarily, therefore, *craniology* and not *phrenology*, and should not have been honored by its indiscreet friends with a name which does not properly belong to it. So far as the force of a name is concerned, they have in this way converted the noble science of mind (as one expresses it) into "a mere Golgotha — a place of skulls."

Our second remark is, that, so far as important practical knowl-

edge is concerned, phrenology teaches *nothing new*. One would think, from the boasts of its friends, from the sounding eulogiums which they are wont to pass upon it, that it had introduced a new era in philosophy, and should be regarded as the guiding star of the age. They claim that it is the most valuable discovery ever made, and that it will contribute more important aid towards the education and gradual improvement of the race, than can be derived from any other source. "Before the appearance of Gall and Spurzheim," says Mr. Combe, "the science of mind was in much the same state as that of the heavenly bodies, prior to Galileo and Newton." Again, he says: "The discoveries of the revolution of the globe, and the circulation of the blood, were splendid displays of genius in their authors, and interesting and beneficial to mankind; but their results, compared with the consequences which must inevitably follow from Dr. Gall's discovery of the functions of the brain, sink into relative insignificance."¹

Let us, then, look at the subject a little, and see whether these boasts have ever been realized; see what phrenology has done, or is likely to do, for the benefit of the world. It has told us a great deal — which we do not believe — about the functions and organs of the brain, and the ability of the operator, by fumbling over the head, to decide upon the mental traits and character of its owner. It has introduced a new and barbarous phraseology, under cover of which the commonest truths are made to assume a strange and scientific appearance. Still, it may be said, and said in truth, that so far as *important practical* knowledge is concerned, phrenology teaches nothing new. It was known, ages ago, that there were important differences among men in genius, disposition, propensities, habits, and traits of moral and religious character. Phrenology has taught us nothing new on this subject, except that it refers these different traits to different bumps on the head, a theory which we have shown to be unfounded, and which, if it were true, would be a circumstance of very little importance. Again; it was known, long before phrenology was born, that the exercise of any faculty, or the indulgence of any propensity or habit, tended to increase and strengthen it; and

¹ At the close of the fourteenth volume of their *Phrenological Journal*, the Messrs. Fowler very modestly say: "The Journal has done *more* to create an interest in the true philosophy of mind, and to awaken a spirit of self-culture, than all other periodicals, since its establishment." "Let another praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips." Prov. 27: 2,

hence, that it was indispensable, in a good moral education, to repress the indulgence of everything evil, and encourage the exercise of everything good. Phrenology has nothing new on this subject, except its uncouth phraseology; and that only serves to make a plain matter obscure, or (as the Scripture hath it) to "darken counsel by words without knowledge."

The great object of Mr. Combe, in his popular work on "the Constitution of Man," is to show, that we are made subject to three classes of laws, *physical, organic* and *moral*; and that *suffering* is the penalty for violating any of them. But men knew all this before. Who did not know, that, if he stepped off a precipice, he would fall and hurt him; that, if he overloaded his stomach, he would suffer from indigestion; and that, if he was wicked and cruel, his conscience would be likely to trouble him more or less. We are constrained to think, therefore, that this most popular of all phrenological books has added very little to the extent of human knowledge. Stripped of its phrenological cant and verbiage, it will be found to contain little more than stale truisms, some of which the child will understand, especially after he has had a few hard falls, or has made himself sick once or twice by eating green fruit, or has felt some twinges of conscience, after striking his brother, or telling a lie.

Indeed, Mr. Combe, in his more candid moments, does not pretend to have advanced anything of importance that is new. "I lay no claim," says he in his Preface, "to originality of conception. The materials employed lie open to all men. Taken separately, I would hardly say that a new truth has been presented, in the following work. The facts have nearly all been admitted and employed, again and again, by writers on morals, from the time of Socrates down to the present day."

What Mr. Combe here acknowledges of himself, is more eminently true of inferior writers and speakers on the same subject. A gentleman in England, "who had been most successfully engaged in the business of education for more than forty years, was induced to attend a course of phrenological lectures, under the assurance that this new philosophy would afford him vast assistance in his vocation. But at the close of the lectures he solemnly declared, he had not heard a single principle enunciated, which had not been constantly in his view, from the time when the claims of phrenology were unknown in Britain."

We would go even further than this, and say, with Mr. Morell,

✓ that, so far as *mind* is concerned, phrenology never can teach anything new. It can only assign certain *ascertained* mental qualities and propensities to what are conceived to be their appropriate organs on the skull. But by the supposition, *these* mental qualities are *already ascertained*. They *must* be ascertained, every one of them. And we must come to the knowledge of them in the ordinary way, that is, by *reflection* and *consciousness*, before the phrenologist can get hold of them, and assign them to their material organs.

Our next objection to phrenology grows out of its bearings and teachings on the subject of *education*. Much credit is claimed for it, by its advocates, on the score of education. Parents have been earnestly advised to obtain *charts* of their children's heads, that they may know early their dispositions and propensities, and thus be able to conduct their education in the wisest manner. And, if any accurate, reliable knowledge could be obtained in this way, we allow that it might be of some importance. But suppose (what is undoubtedly the fact) that *no* such reliable knowledge can be obtained. Suppose the parent, instead of getting any true ideas concerning his children, gets the opposite; instead of being instructed, he is deceived. The influence of phrenology, in this view, can only be hurtful, both to parents and children. There is a *natural* method in which parents are to learn the particular genius, the aptitudes, the propensities, and dispositions of their children; and this is by close *observation* and *watchfulness*. But the parent has no time, or no heart for this. He must come to his conclusions by a shorter cut. And so he applies to the phrenologist, and gets a chart. But his chart is no better than white paper. In fact, it is a great deal worse. White paper would not deceive him; whereas his chart, if he relies upon it, will be very likely to lead him astray.

Nor is the effect of the process any better upon children and young persons. They are led to believe that they have got the truth, respecting their talents, their genius, their disposition, their destiny; and they follow it out as such, until they find, too late, that they have been deluded. More than one case we have ourselves known, in which young men have been completely baffled, turned aside from their appropriate pursuits, and in effect almost ruined, by trusting to their phrenological advisers.

But this is not the only way in which phrenology bears disastrously on the cause of education. Its doctrine of distinct, inde-

pendent organs and faculties, is not only false in fact, but injurious in its influence. The doctrine is, as we have before remarked, that these numerous mental faculties are *so* distinct, that the exercise and improvement of one, has no tendency to improve any other. "It would be as unreasonable," says Mr. Simpson, "to attempt to sharpen hearing by exercising the eyes," as to improve one mental faculty, by working another. Now we all know that this statement is not true. Almost any sort of mental application imparts strength and vigor to the *whole* mind; just as exercising the arms, the legs, the chest, diffuses strength and elasticity through the entire frame.

And not only is this position false in fact, it is of hurtful *influence*. It is this which has led phrenologists to oppose the study of the ancient languages, and the regular, grammatical study of all languages. "By such study," says Mr. Levison, "the mind is cramped; many of the most useful faculties remain in a state of inactivity; while *verbal memory*, like an especial favorite, engrosses all attention to itself." This writer admits "that a knowledge of our vernacular tongue is of great importance," yet this, he thinks, may be better acquired "without the usual drudgery of poring over a grammar. Let a child know the names of all things it sees, and how we express their qualities and modes of existence, and this plan, combined with a free intercourse with intelligent adults, will practically point out," without a grammar, "the natural mode of arranging words to give the order of our ideas."

Nor are languages the only study which phrenology proscribes. Listen to the following edifying passage from the Rev. George Blackburn: "What has the study of *mathematics* to do with giving success to one in the clerical profession, or to one who is occupied with the study of moral philosophy? Or what has Greek or Latin to do with a successful prosecution of the science of astronomy, or of chemistry? Oh, it will be said, the study of mathematics is essential to the clergyman and moral philosopher, because it tends wonderfully to discipline and strengthen the understanding; and that of the Greek and Latin, because they make us better acquainted with our vernacular language, and tend likewise to elevate and expand the mind. Now phrenology demonstrates that there is *no sort of relation between mathematical and moral reasoning*; that they depend upon *different and distinct faculties*; and that, by necessary consequence, the former may

be exercised forever, without *in the least disciplining or improving the latter*. And as to languages, it shows that a knowledge of them is obtained through the medium of a single faculty, which may be powerfully active even in the semi-idiot, who is well-nigh incapable of combining two ideas and inferring from them a third."

This remarkable passage is in harmony with the general strain of phrenological teaching on the same subject. Its positions are justly deducible from the doctrine of *numerous distinct faculties and organs* — so distinct, that the exercise of one tends not at all to the improvement of any other. And yet these positions are so palpably false, and of so evidently destructive bearing upon all the interests of education, that they might be sufficient alone to refute and demolish the whole phrenological theory. "Phrenology *demonstrates* that there is no sort of relation between mathematical and moral reasoning! that they depend upon different and distinct faculties! and that, by necessary consequence, the former may be exercised forever, without in the least disciplining or improving the latter!" It *demonstrates*, that "a knowledge of languages is obtained through the medium of a single faculty, which may be powerfully active, even in the semi-idiot!" If phrenology *demonstrates* all this, we have only to say that it demonstrates a tissue of *gross falsehoods*; and thus proves itself *untrue*. And not only so, it lays its axe at the root of all sound and reliable systems of education. Carried consistently out, it would overturn all our higher institutions of learning, and reduce us quickly to a semi-savage and uncultivated state.

But we have a more serious charge against phrenology, than either of those which have been noticed. We are constrained to regard it as of a *dangerous moral and religious tendency*; and that in several ways.

In the first place, its tendencies are to *materialism*. We do not say that it absolutely and necessarily leads to this; much less would we say that all phrenologists are materialists. And yet the *tendency* is obviously and strongly in that direction. We hear so much of the brain, and the numerous organs of the brain, and are told so confidently that everything depends upon the size and shape of the organs, that we come naturally to the conclusion that the man is *all organs*; that he has no mind, no soul besides. So much is made to depend upon the *material* in man, that the spiritual is overlooked, if not discarded.

With regard to this question of materialism, phrenologists may be divided into three classes. First, those who are *not* materialists. These hold that man *has* a soul distinct, in nature, from the body, and that the brain is but the material organ through which the spirit acts; just as the external senses are organs through which we become acquainted with the outer world. This is altogether the better class of phrenologists; and yet, to their more advanced brethren, they are objects of suspicion, if not contempt. They are regarded as the slaves of an early prejudice, and as afraid to carry out a new and noble science to its best results.

The second class of phrenologists are in *doubt*, whether man has any soul distinct from the body, or not, and believe the question to be quite insolvable and unimportant. Thus Mr. Combe says: "The solution of this question," as to the material or immaterial nature of the soul, "is not only unimportant but impossible." A writer in the Edinburgh Phrenological Journal says: "We know nothing whatever concerning the substance of the mind," whether it be material, or not. A writer in the "Annals of Phrenology," an American publication, echoes the same sentiment: "No one knows whether the human mind is material, or not."

But the third class of phrenologists, the more advanced class, those who think themselves the most faithful expounders of the doctrine, have no doubt at all on the subject. They believe the whole man to be constituted of matter, and that there is no proper distinction between the body and the soul. Thus one tells us: "A spirit is no immaterial substance. On the contrary, the spiritual organization is composed of matter, in a very high state of refinement and attenuation." Another says: "Immaterial substance or essence is a mere abstraction of the human imagination, altogether unknown to our senses or understanding. Everything we see, hear and feel, is material, and our own minds are unknown to us, except as incorporated with matter." Still another says: "As we never become acquainted with either the living or the intelligent principle, unconnected with material organization, so we have no philosophical reason to regard them as separate existences. They may be properties of peculiarly constructed matter." A philosopher of this class once said to us, that "the brain generates ideas as really and truly as the liver does bile," and that "it is nonsense to think or speak of anything pertaining to us, which is not matter."

We trust that nothing further need be said as to the *tendencies* of phrenology. They are naturally and obviously to a gross materialism. Thither its bolder and more consistent advocates speedily arrive; and those who are restrained from it are held back, not by anything in the system itself, but by other and better influences.

By its bearings towards materialism, phrenology tends, of necessity, to *fatalism*; a denial of the proper free agency of man, and his responsibility for his actions. Materialism always ends in fatalism. Not an instance, we presume, can be found, from the times of the old Greek philosophers to the present, of an individual, who regarded the whole man as *material*, who denied the proper distinction between body and soul, without also denying free agency and human accountability. Why should it not be so? How can it be otherwise? Material atoms cannot make a *will*—a *free will*. Material atoms cannot choose, refuse, desire, resolve, and act, and feel responsible for their actions. Material atoms cannot *move*, except as they are moved, and that, too, by physical causes; and there is no more voluntariness in their motions, than there is in the motions of a clock, or a mill.

But phrenology tends to fatalism, not only as it tends to materialism, but because it entirely and confessedly *takes away the human will*. It destroys not only free will, but the will itself. The will has no organ assigned to it on the cranium; it is not once mentioned among our faculties; and in place of it we have only a congeries of instincts and impulses, which move as they are moved, and control the man. Thus one writer says: "Man is not less a bundle of instincts, than were the fasces which were carried before the Roman consuls a bundle of twigs." And Spurzheim says: "Will is no more a fundamental power, than is the instinct of animals. It is only the *effect* of every primitive faculty of the mind. Each faculty being active, produces an inclination, a desire, a *kind of will*."

But in taking away the human will, and substituting instincts and impulses in its place, phrenology must, of course, destroy human freedom. There can be no free agency without a will, any more than there can be thought or reason without an intellect. And when free agency is gone, moral character and responsibility, and the sense of good and ill desert, are gone with it; and nothing is left to guide the actions of men but blind instincts and impulses,

amounting to a physical necessity. Men *must* act according to their organs and impulses, whether these be good or evil.

And what is the bearing of such a doctrine upon the nature of *sin* and *crime*, and the *desert of punishment*? This question opens a field of thought too important to be passed lightly over. Sin, according to the phrenologists, is rather a *misfortune* to be pitied; a *disease* to be, if possible, curbed and cured, than a *moral wrong*, an *offence* against God, for which the perpetrator is guilty and deserving of punishment. Thus Mr. Combe says: "According to this view, certain individuals are *unfortunate* at birth, in having received organs from their parents so ill-proportioned, that abuse of them is an almost *inevitable consequence*." "There exist individuals," says Prof. Caldwell, "who steal, and others who deceive and lie, by a force of instinct which seems *irresistible*. In others, the instinct of *destructiveness* is like that of the tiger. Nothing can appease it but blood." Mr. Combe represents the convicted criminal as "*the victim of his own nature, and external condition*." At the same time, "he is not the *cause* of the unfortunate preponderance of the animal organs in his brain. Neither is he the cause of the external circumstances which lead his propensities into abuse." He is, therefore, to be pitied more than blamed. He is to be taken care of and restrained, so that he may not be left to injure himself or others, but not *punished*, as though he had done anything wilfully wrong.

Having exhibited the head of Pope Alexander VI., or what purports to be a drawing of his head, Mr. Combe further says: "Such a brain is no more *adequate* to the manifestation of Christian virtues, than the brain of an idiot is to the exhibition of the intellect of a Leibnitz or a Bacon." "Such a head is unfit for *any* employment of a superior kind, and never gives birth to sentiments of humanity."

Pope Alexander VI. was, indeed, a monster of wickedness. He has been called, not improperly, "the Nero of the Pontiffs." But, according to the view here taken, wherein was he culpable? Wherein was he, properly speaking, wicked at all? "His brain was no more *adequate* to the manifestation of Christian virtues, than the brain of an idiot." He was the victim, therefore, of his brain, which he had no hand in creating, and for which he was to be pitied, but not blamed. It was unfortunate, indeed, that he was exalted to so high a station, that he was placed in circumstances to do so much mischief. But we are in fault in

pronouncing him a monster of *wickedness*, who justly deserves the execration of mankind.

The New York Phrenological Journal presents us with the picture of another head—whether from life, or not, we cannot say—and descants upon it in the following terms: “Such a head will be sensual in love; ferocious, stubborn, and contrary in disposition; a glutton in appetite; destitute of taste and refinement; stupid in intellect; incapable of reasoning; and extremely low in moral emotion; a natural vagabond, open to all the excitements to low and vulgar criminality; a being who, for the sake of society, should be guarded by law, as we would a lunatic.”

We are here presented with a character, embodying all the bad qualities which can cluster around, or be crowded into, a human being. And yet, in what respect is he strictly *blameworthy* for one of them? They grow out of the conformation of his head; and he did not make his head. As Mr. Combe says: “He was not the cause of the unfortunate preponderance of the animal organs in his brain. Nor was he the cause of the external circumstances which led his propensities astray.” He is, therefore, to be pitied, but not blamed. He is to be confined and taken care of, but not punished. In the language of the Journal just quoted: He is “a being who, for the sake of society, should be guarded *by law*, as we would a lunatic.”

Observe, he is to “be guarded *by law*.” But how is the law to take hold of such an one? For what is he to be indicted? We see not for what, unless it be for the shape of his head. He may not have *done* anything, as yet, to merit punishment. Indeed, on the theory before us, he *cannot* do anything to merit punishment. Of course, he must be tried for the shape of his head, and tried before a jury of phrenologists; because no others would be competent to try him. The Lord save the poor fellow from the tender mercies of such a jury!

The right to try and confine a man for the shape of his head, or, in phrenological phraseology, for his *developments*, is here presented in the shape of inference; though we think a just inference from the premises given. But some of the phrenologists advocate it openly. Thus Prof. Caldwell says: “Convicts should be sentenced to a period of imprisonment and discipline, proportioned, not only to the enormity of any single crime, but to their age and *developments*. Were two youths convicted of crimes precisely alike, or as accomplices in the same crime, the one of

better, the other of much worse *developments*, the latter should be sentenced to *the longest discipline*." A writer in the Edinburgh Phrenological Journal, speaking of prisoners, says: "The measure of the restraint ought to bear reference, not so much to the amount of crime actually committed, as to the degree of criminal *tendency* in the individual." "Persons having brains of" a certain "class ought to be viewed as moral patients, and treated as such; and *the form of their brains*, combined with their manifestation of criminal *tendencies*, should be sufficient to warrant their being subjected to *treatment*," i. e. confinement. "This," he adds, "is the grand practical principle that must be adopted and acted on, before a successful result in criminal legislation can be reached."

Here, then, we have it, on the highest phrenological authority. Men should be tried, convicted and imprisoned, not so much for actual crime committed, as for their "criminal *tendencies*," their cranial "*developments*," the "*form of their brains*."! "This is the grand practical principle that must be adopted and acted on, before a successful result in criminal legislation can be reached."!!

But we have not yet done with the positions of the phrenologists, as to the nature of crime, and desert of punishment. Mr. Combe speaks of three sources of crime, and only three: "First, particular organs are too large, and spontaneously too active; secondly, great excitement produced by external causes; and, thirdly, ignorance of what are uses, and what abuses, of the faculties." And each of these causes, he says, "exists, independently of the will of the offender." The will, therefore, as we might expect on phrenological principles, has nothing to do with the causes of crime at all. It is excluded.

But in excluding the will, it is obvious that Mr. Combe excludes that which is, in fact, the cause of *all* crime, without which it is impossible that *crime* should exist. He forgets, or does not consider, what *crime* is. "It is not simply evil, but evil arising from one definite source; and that the very source which phrenology excludes, viz. the consent of a free, responsible *will*. The crime of murder, for example, is not simply the killing of a man. The man must be killed *maliciously, wilfully*. Destructiveness, in the sense of the phrenologists, may be a remote cause; but if it be destructiveness, apart from a responsible and consenting will, as in the case of a maniac, or a ravenous beast, it is not *murder*. It is, in fact, no *crime* at all." It follows, from Mr. Combe's theory as to the causes of crime, that there is, in fact, no such

thing as crime; and so we are brought back to the same conclusion as before: The criminal incurs no guilt, and deserves no punishment. He is the mere victim of his nature, and of external circumstances.

Nor is Mr. Combe alone in this conclusion. It is concurred in, as we have seen, by all the more distinguished phrenologists. Their idea is, that bad dispositions and criminal acts, imply *disease*, rather than guilt. All wrong character is a *brain disorder*, as much as fever is a disorder of the body; and we can no more *will away* the former, than the latter. The words sin, guilt, blame-worthiness, ill-desert, have no place in the nomenclature of these men, as they have no ideas corresponding to them in their philosophy.

And the proper idea of *punishment* is as foreign from their system, as is that of sin. Punishment, we are told, serves only to "irritate and inflame the propensity which it was designed to check. We might as well undertake to whip a sore, or beat the typhus fever out of the body, or steady a wild horse with spurs," as to reform a vicious mind by punishment. "The only effect will be to chafe the disorder into greater malignity."

The true course, therefore, is, to treat the transgressor as a *patient* or a *lunatic*, in the hands of a physician, rather than as a culprit deserving punishment. "Capital punishments should be forthwith abolished; prisons should be turned into hospitals; the rod of the parent and teacher should be laid aside; the diseased, over-worked organs should be put to rest; while their too feeble neighbors should be fed and drilled into activity." Punishment for crime, and reward for well-doing, are both entirely foreign to the system. They "both appeal to the animal feelings, and thus serve to defeat their own proper end, which is to set the *moral* feelings on the throne."

That we do not misrepresent here the great teachers of phrenology, might be shown, were it necessary, by further quotations. Says a writer in the *Edinburgh Journal*: "No one would propose to punish a man capitally for being infected with a contagious disease; although by putting him to death, at its first appearance, we might save many lives more valuable than his. Yet it would be as becoming to do this, and thereby protect society from *physical* contagion, as to guard it from *moral* contagion, by the destruction of a patient, who was defective in his moral constitution."

Mr. Simpson says: "When penitentiaries shall be held to be *hospitals for moral patients*, and not engines to protect society, by holding out the spectacle of the sufferings of perfectly *free agents*, either paying back the loss which their actions have occasioned, or deterring others from crimes by their example; the duration of the convict's detention will depend, not upon the mere act which brought him there, but upon the continuance of his disease." The purport of this long, bungling and obscure passage is, that men are *not* "perfectly free agents;" that sins and crimes are to be regarded and treated as particular forms of disease; that prisons should be considered as hospitals, and not places of punishment; and that the term of confinement should be regulated, not by the nature of the crime committed, but by the continuance of the disorder.

Mr. Simpson's whole book (and the same is true of Mr. Levi-son's) is based upon this one idea. Their plan of "efficient protection from crime" is, to lay hold of the offender, on the first breaking out of his disease, and keep him until the remedial process is completed. Murder, they tell us, comes from "homicidal insanity," or "diseased destructiveness. To torment the murderer will not annihilate this propensity. The only remedy is, to stifle the disease, by exciting the other propensities into predominance."

Much has been thought and written, within the last thirty years, on the punishment of crime, and the proper treatment of its perpetrators. A strong sympathy has been awakened for poor criminals, thieves, robbers, murderers, adulterers, because they have been punished in some instances *severely*, as they deserved. This course of remark, assuming the appearance of great philanthropy and benevolence, was received with some favor for a time; but the public have, at length, become nauseated with it. They see through it; see the folly and mischief of it; and will not tolerate it further. When a man knocks us down upon the highway, and steals our purse; when he fires our dwelling, and destroys our property, and perhaps our family; sensible people cannot see why all the sympathy of the community should be lavished upon *him*, rather than upon *us*; why he should be caressed, and cared for, and screened from punishment, and nursed and sheltered in a hospital, at the public expense; while *we* are left, unprotected, to bear our injuries as best we may.

Sensible people are beginning to inquire, too, as to the cause of these new-fangled notions. Where did they come from? How did they originate? These inquiries, if pursued, will lead directly, and by a very short process, to phrenology. The pernicious notions of which we speak, came in upon us from phrenology. They have been nurtured and strengthened by it. They grow right out of it, as we have seen, and can be removed only by removing the cause. When we return to the plain teachings of the Bible and of common sense on this subject; when we come to regard man as a free, responsible agent, whose acts are his own; when we come to regard him as *guilty* for his crimes, and deserving of punishment, in proportion to his guilt; when society is left, unembarrassed by the whinings and whimperings of miscalled philanthropists, to *inflict* such punishment, without the prospect or hope of escape; then the wicked will begin to fear, and crime will begin to diminish, and property and life will be more secure.

We might speak of other social evils growing out of these phrenological speculations, more especially as they bear upon the union of the sexes, and the permanence and happiness of the marriage relation. It would seem from much that we read and hear, that those who have bad heads or disordered bodies, that is, from a fourth to a third of our whole race, ought not to marry at all. Thus, one writer says, and Mr. Combe endorses the statement, that all "persons in any way constitutionally enfeebled, persons predisposed to scrofula, pulmonary consumption, gout, or epilepsy, should conscientiously abstain from matrimony." Or if, in an evil hour, such persons have been married, the union had better be dissolved. These ill-shapen heads and disordered bodies should not be multiplied. There is quite enough of them in the world already.

This doctrine is adapted, if not to prevent or dissolve the marriage relation, to produce *discontent* and *unhappiness* in it. A pleasant couple, we will suppose, soon after marriage, submit their heads to the examination of some practised phrenologist, and he decides that they are essentially unlike. One is intellectual, the other stupid. One is gentle, the other obstinate. One is open-hearted and generous, the other selfish and miserly. Now here is a *terrible secret* laid open to this happy couple. They learn — what they did not know before, though they may have been intimately acquainted for years — that they have no

congeniality, that they ought never to have come together, and that they have no prospect of living peacefully, much less happily. And this revelation of their probable destiny will have a mighty influence in accomplishing it. The more they confide in what has been said to them, and the more they ponder it, the more will their connubial joys be marred, and the cup of life will be embittered.

But we cannot dwell longer on this topic. We must dismiss it with a word, and hasten to the religious bearings of the subject before us. We profess to be a Christian people. We profess to believe and revere the Bible, and to find our religion there. How, then, do the teachings of phrenology compare with those of the Holy Scriptures? How far do they agree together?

The views which have been already presented will enable us to answer these questions, in part. The Bible teaches the existence of a soul, distinct from the body, of another substance from the body, which is to survive the body, and live in a future state. In other words, it sets its face against every form and degree of materialism. When the body returns to the earth, as it was, *the spirit* is to return to God who gave it. But phrenology, we have seen, if it does not end *necessarily* in materialism, ends there very frequently, in *fact*. It has a strong bearing in that direction, and many of its advocates, and those, too, who claim to be most enlightened, are professed materialists. "Immaterial substance," they say, "is a mere abstraction of the human imagination, altogether unknown to our senses or understanding." But so far as phrenology does tend to materialism, its bearings, its tendencies are obviously against the Bible.

Again; the Bible assumes everywhere, that man is a free, responsible agent, that his acts are his own, and that he is justly accountable for them. As much as this is implied in all the commands of Scripture; in its exhortations, warnings, persuasions, motives; and in its repeated annunciations of a coming day, when we must give an account of ourselves to God. But in respect to this matter of moral agency, phrenology teaches quite another doctrine. It denies to man the faculty of *will*, and represents his actions as the result of his cerebral organization, and of external circumstances; conditions which he did not create, and over which he has no control.

Still again; the Bible speaks of sin, not as a misfortune, or as merely an evil, but as an *offence*, a *wrong*, to God, to the universe,

and to the soul of the perpetrator; as that which confers guilt, and justly exposes to Divine punishment. But all this is childish and obsolete, in the ears of the practised phrenologist. Such notions may have been current once, but not now. They are among the things which, in these times of progress, have waxed old, and are ready to vanish away. Sin is a disease, not a crime. It confers no stain of guilt. It carries with it no ill-desert. Its perpetrator should be pitied, and, if dangerous to himself or to society, should be taken care of; but let him not be punished, by God or man, in this world or the next. We might as well "whip a sore, or beat the typhus fever out of a man's body, or steady a wild horse with spurs."

The whole scheme of redemption, as revealed in the Scriptures, rests on the supposition, that men are guilty, self-ruined creatures, whom Christ came into the world to seek and to save. But if men are not in the situation here supposed; if they are not personally sinful, guilty, and deserving of punishment,—and phrenology assures us they are not; then this scheme of redemption, so called, is all a farce. It is not needed, it cannot be applied, nor are we to suppose that the alleged facts of it ever occurred.

Thus far we have the light of the foregoing discussion to aid us in our present inquiry; to show us the *disagreement*, the *contradiction*, between phrenology and Christianity. But in justice to the subject, we cannot stop here. Phrenology conflicts with the Bible in various other parts, and we feel constrained to push the inquiry further.

The Bible teaches that *all selfishness is sinful in the sight of God*. Paul describes a state of great declension, when he says: "*All seek their own*, not the things that are Jesus Christ's." He predicts a state of still greater wickedness, when he says again: "*Men shall be lovers of their own selves*, covetous, proud, boasters, blasphemous," etc. If selfishness is not, as some think, the root and element of all sin, there can be no doubt that it is a base and sinful affection, which no rational being should ever indulge, but of which all men should be ashamed. Compare, now, these obviously Christian principles with the teachings of phrenology on the same subject. The Rev. Mr. Weaver, a distinguished American phrenologist, thus describes, in his Lectures, *the selfish sentiments*: "They are devoted exclusively, absolutely to the good of self. They have no interest in the well-being of

any body else. For them there is but one object, and that is self. That is dear above everything else — the world, and *all* to them." And why does he describe so elaborately and truly the selfish sentiments? To condemn them as the Bible does? Not at all, but to praise them. He goes on to say that these selfish sentiments "should be preserved, educated, cherished, as sacredly as any other affection! They are a part of the mind, a part of the living, eternal being, which is God's child, and bears his image!" pp. 128, 129. We can conceive of nothing more directly contrary to both reason and revelation than this. And yet it is a genuine fruit and outbreak of the phrenological philosophy. These selfish sentiments have each and all of them their bumps upon the head, and they must be exercised. The infinite Creator placed them there; and to impugn or condemn them, is to condemn his handiwork.

The Bible represents man as not only a sinful being, but *naturally* sinful, and, until renewed by Divine grace, *entirely* so. "Every imagination and thought of his heart is only evil, and that continually." "And were *by nature* children of wrath." But phrenology, as might be supposed from remarks before made, teaches no such thing. All heads have their good bumps, as well as their bad ones, and the character resulting from them must necessarily be a mixed one of good and evil. "I am astonished," says Dr. Spurzheim, "to observe so much goodness in the world. Its abundance necessarily proves that man is *naturally* good." Vol. II. p. 152.

Again; man being what he is by nature, the Bible speaks of a great *moral change* as necessary, in order to salvation. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Marvel not that I said unto you, *Ye must be born again.*" And not only does the Bible set forth the necessity of such a change, it furnishes numerous instances to illustrate it. Such were those of Paul, and the jailer, and the three thousand on the day of Pentecost. Like instances are occurring, in great numbers, in modern times. Here is a man, we will suppose, who has been a reprobate for years; setting at defiance every law of God and man; reckless, selfish, intemperate, profane. But at length a happy change comes over him. He is led to think upon his ways, and turns his feet unto God's testimonies. Every law which he once had broken, he now tries to keep. He is generous, conscientious, benevolent, and temperate in all things. He

walks in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless. Now in what way is this change (and there are many such) to be accounted for, on phrenological principles? Did it originate with a corresponding change in the shape of the head? Or has it been followed by any such change? Had this man's head been examined just before conversion, all the *baser* organs must have been found, if phrenology is true, largely developed, while *veneration*, *conscientiousness*, *benevolence*, etc. could hardly have been found at all. Had the same head been examined shortly after conversion, it must have been found in a very altered condition. The organs which before had almost disappeared, now stand out with amazing prominence; while the baser organs, so large before, have shrunk away almost to nothing.

The question now is: Has any such change in the head occurred? Who has observed it? Who believes it? Yet it *must* have occurred, if phrenology is true, and if the phrenologist is able to decide accurately upon the character, by feeling the outside of the head.

We know it will be said that the change need not have taken place in the size of the organs, but only in their activity. Those which were active before conversion are dormant now; while those which before were dormant, are now roused into great activity. But how is this changed activity discoverable outside the skull? How does the feeler of heads know anything about it, except that, having learned the altered character of his subject, he infers, of course, that it must be so?

In this work of moral renovation, the Scriptures ascribe a mighty efficacy to the Spirit's influences. "Who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." But phrenology neither makes any account of these influences, nor leaves any room for them. Its language is: 'Take care of your organs. Cultivate your good propensities, and repress your bad ones. Stir up the good that is naturally in you, and you will be good enough. You need no other renovation than this.'

The Bible professes to reveal God's *truth*, and binds all those who read it to receive the truth and obey it. It makes the rejection of plainly revealed truth not only an error, but a sin. Heresy is always represented in the Scriptures as sinful; in some instances fatally so. But all this is widely different from

the teachings of phrenology. "The diversities of doctrine in religion," says Mr. Combe, "owe their origin to ignorance of the primitive faculties and their relations. The faculties differ in strength in different individuals, and each person is most alive to objects and views connected with the powers predominant in himself. Hence, in reading the Scriptures, one person is convinced that they establish Calvinism; another, possessing a different combination of faculties, discovers in them Lutheranism; while a third is satisfied that Socinianism is the only true interpretation."

In reply to all this, we have only to ask: Is there not such a thing as revealed *truth*? Is not this truth *one* and *immutable*? Are not those who read the Bible bound to receive it, and obey it? And does not this imply that they are capable of learning what it is?

In the Scriptures, the preaching of the *Gospel* is represented as the grand *means* of enlightening and recovering lost men. "Go ye into all the world, and preach *the Gospel* to every creature." "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." But Mr. Combe does not think much of preaching the Gospel. He would prefer to have men instructed about their organs and faculties, and the laws of their physical and moral being. "Divines should introduce the *natural laws* into their discourses, and teach people the works and institutions of the Creator." They should not "represent Christianity as a system of spiritual influences, of internal operations on the soul, and of repentant preparation for another life," but rather as an "exposition of pure and lofty principles, addressed to responding faculties in human nature itself, and therefore capable of being applied in this world." But how much good does Mr. Combe think such preaching would do, in a world like this? How much has it done? Who ever heard of a revival of religion, or of individual conversions, under a phrenological lecture? Nations have often been civilized and Christianized — some in our own times — under the influence of the Gospel. Has such a thing ever occurred under the influence of phrenology? Men may preach about organs, and faculties, and physical laws, and constitutional propensities, as long as they please, and those who listen to them will wax worse and worse. It is the Gospel, and that alone, which, under God, subdues the heart, reforms the life, and prepares the recov-

ered soul for usefulness and heaven ; and all this has been proved, by actual experiment, a thousand times over.

We are taught in the Scriptures that the Gospel is adapted to the wants of *all men*, publicans, magdalens, harlots, the poor, the degraded, the vicious, drawn from the highways and hedges of the world ; none are too low to be reached by those influences which are provided and proffered in the Gospel of Christ. But this precious, glorious feature of the Gospel, like many others, is contradicted by phrenology. This teaches that men, with a certain class of heads, are impracticable, incurable. They are beyond the reach of moral means, and the power of Gospel truth. Take, for example, such a head as that of Pope Alexander VI., which Mr. Combe says "is no more *adequate* to the manifestation of Christian virtues than is the brain of an idiot" for high intellectual pursuits ; or such a head as that given in Fowler's Journal, which the writer tells us "will be sensual in love, ferocious in disposition, a glutton in appetite ; a natural vagabond, open to all the excitements to low and vulgar criminality ; a being who, for the sake of society, should be guarded by law, as we would a lunatic." The difficulty with such characters, it must be borne in mind, is not primarily in their depraved dispositions. If this were all, the influences of the Gospel might recover and save them. But the root of the difficulty, on phrenological principles, lies further back. It is in the shape of their heads ; the conformation of their brains ; and how is the Gospel to reach and transform these ? What adaptedness is there in moral means of any kind to the accomplishment of such an end ? Obviously, none at all. The work is impossible, except to the direct interposition of miraculous power ; and the representation of Scripture, that the Gospel is suited to the necessities of all men, however low, degraded and vicious, is flatly contradicted.

The Bible has much to say on the *efficacy* of prayer. It assures us, that, when God's people cry to him for mercy, he hears and answers them. Abraham interceded for Lot, and Lot was delivered. Elijah prayed for rain, and the rain came. "The effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." But Mr. Combe has no confidence in the power of prayer to affect the issue of events. It may do good to the suppliant. It may have a favorable influence upon his mind and heart. But that it has any power and influence with God, is

wholly incredible. Now we admit that prayer *does* have a favorable influence upon the mind and heart of the suppliant. No doubt of it. But is this the *great* benefit of prayer? Is this the main object and end of it, as set forth in the Scriptures? Who believes that the main object of Elijah, in praying for rain, was not to secure the blessing of rain, but to promote his own piety and spiritual improvement? Besides; how long would prayer be offered, and its good influences upon the suppliant be realized, if no other object were aimed at? How long should we continue to pray, if we believed that to petition God was but a form — fallacious, but yet wholesome — of preaching to ourselves, and promoting our own growth in grace?

We mention but another instance in which the teachings of phrenology seem to us to conflict with the Bible. The Scriptures assert that the soul of man is to exist, to be intelligent, conscious and active, while the body is in the grave. Paul expected, while “absent from the body, to be present with the Lord.” He tells us that, in the heavenly Jerusalem, dwell “the spirits of just men made perfect.” In the visions of Patmos, John saw them there. He beheld their glory, and listened to their songs. But if the whole man is matter, as some phrenologists pretend, then there is no soul to exist while separate from the body. We are all body, and the whole man sleeps together in the dust. Or, if we adopt the opinion of the better class of phrenologists, that, though there is a mind distinct from the body, yet that the brain is the indispensable *organ* of the mind, without which it cannot think, or feel, or do anything; then, when the brain is dead, must not the mind be dead with it? At least, must not all mental activity cease, and the soul pass into a state of entire unconsciousness?

We see not how such an inference is to be avoided, unless we say, with some, that, when the soul leaves this gross body, it enters at once into a spiritual body, rises in it at death, and that this is all the resurrection which is to be expected. But this again is to contradict the Bible, and that in two respects. First, the Bible teaches, that the *same body* which is laid in the dust is to be raised in the resurrection. The same *it* which “is sown in corruption, is to be raised in incorruption;” which “is sown in weakness, is to be raised in power;” which “is sown a natural body, is to be raised a spiritual body.” The Bible also teaches, that this resurrection is to be accomplished, not in the

moment of death, but in the morning of the last day. "This is the will of him that sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again *at the last day.*"

We here take our leave of the subject of phrenology; having looked at it in various lights, and treated it as largely as time and opportunity will permit. We have shown, first of all, that its fundamental principles are not to be relied upon. They are not supported by appropriate evidence; they are without foundation. We have traced the subject, also, in its social and practical, its moral and religious bearings, and have shown that it is of hurtful tendency in them all. It can never be reconciled with the Bible, or with the best interests of society, more than it can with physiology and the facts of science. ✓

In view of all that has been said, we wonder not that phrenology is a favorite subject with innovators, sceptics, radicals and infidels. We wonder not that such men extol it, lecture upon it, make and read its books, and do all in their power to propagate it through the land. This is acting in character. It is just what might be expected of them. But we do wonder that intelligent Christians, members of our churches, who love and honor the Bible, and try to obey it, should be found in such company. We do wonder that such persons should countenance and uphold a system, which conflicts with the Gospel at almost every point, and which, could it have full scope in the earth, would shut the Gospel out of it, and keep it out forever.

ARTICLE III.

EXCURSION TO THE SUMMIT OF HERMON.

By Rev. J. L. Porter, Missionary at Damascus.

August 30th, 1852. We left Blûdân¹ at 6h. 40m. A. M., descended the hill on the ordinary Damascus road, and crossed the beautiful plain of Zebedâny to the fountain of the Barada. We rode at a fast walk and reached the little lake at 8.30. Having lingered here ten minutes, chasing the numerous wildfowl that were skimming over the surface of the water, we remounted and ascended the rugged and barren slopes to Batrûny, where we arrived at 9.30. From Batrûny we followed the road along the foot of the rocky hill toward the eastern entrance of Wady el-Kûrn; but when, within about one mile of the Wady, we turned to the right, and ascended the mountain by a rugged path. At 10.30 we were on the summit, and had a commanding view of the Alpine scenery around us, with the plains stretching out in the distance. The mountain range, on the top of which we now stood, extends unbroken from Wady el-Kûrn to Wady Yahfûfeh, forming the western boundary of the plains of Zebedâny and Sûrghâya. Its direction is about N. 25 E. Its greatest elevation is nearly 6000 feet above the sea. From Zebedâny to Wady el-Kûrn, the sides are rocky and very rugged, and the top broken and jagged; the northern portion is not so lofty and the sides have a gradual slope to the plains on the east. The elevation decreases gradually toward Wady Yahfûfeh; and at the place where Wady el-Kûrn cuts through, it is also somewhat lower. Southward of the latter Wady the ridge extends, but broken and to some extent irregular, to Râsheiya.

We have seen no map, and we believe none has yet appeared, on which the Antilebanon range has been laid down with any approach to accuracy. Berghaus places the loftiest ridge on the western side of the plain of Zebedâny, and continues it northward in a straight unbroken line. Now the fact is, that about one hour north of Wady Yahfûfeh, there are no mountains whatever

¹ Blûdân is the summer residence of the missionaries at Damascus. It lies on the high ridge east of the plain of Zebedâny.—E. R.

in this line; and, further, the loftiest and principal range of Anti-Lebanon is two hours eastward of the above, running immediately on the west side of the village of Dīmās, intersected by the Barada at Sūk, the ancient Abila, and forming the eastern boundary of the plains of Zebedāny and Sūrghāya. Opposite the latter plain, and one hour from the village of Blūdān, is its loftiest summit, which has an elevation of a little over 7000 English feet. From this point its direction is about N. 8 E. with an elevation of about 6000 to 6500 feet.

From the point on which we stood we saw the Druze village of Hilwy, on the mountain top on the other side of Wady el-Kūrūn, distant about one hour and twenty minutes S. 63 W. Descending the mountain by a path which runs parallel to the Wady, we reached its western entrance at 11.5. Here commences the oval-shaped plain called Sahil Judeideh, which runs from this point in a direction N. 12 E. about two hours. Its greatest width may be forty-five minutes. It is separated from the plain of Zebedāny by the mountain ridge we had just crossed. On the eastern side of this plain, about the middle, is the village of Ekfair, between which and the plain is a low hill. Crossing the Beirūt road where it leaves the Wady and enters the plain, we turned S. W. up a rugged valley whose sides are partially clothed with stunted shrubs and dwarf oak. As we entered it we had on our right, distant eight minutes, but concealed by intervening rocks, the small village Mazria'. Following the valley to its upper end, we emerged at 11.45 on an elevated plateau, wild and rocky in the extreme. On our left ran a range of hills which seemed like some Cyclopean wall rent and shattered to its foundations. Turning a little to the westward they shut in the plateau before us, which is also enclosed on the N. W. by a line of wooded heights. Before us, perched upon the jagged summit of the former range, stood Yūntah. At 12.20 we were beside the village, having passed a small fountain just as we commenced our ascent of the hill on which it stands. From this spot, looking behind us down the valley and across the southern part of Sahil Judeideh, we saw the village of Ekfair, on the mountain side.

It was not without considerable apprehension that we approached Yūntah. Its inhabitants, Druzes, we knew to be covetous and bloodthirsty, and its Sheikhs little better than bandit chiefs. Only two weeks before, six of these Sheikhs went in

the night to Sâk-Wady-Barada, entered a house there, tore an unoffending young man from the arms of his wife, and almost hewed him to pieces in her presence; and then coolly rode off with money and jewels which they took from the room, to the amount of £2000 sterling. Mr. Wood, the British Consul at Damascus, who was on his way to Blûdân, was in an adjoining house when the bloody deed was committed. Hearing the wailing of women he ran out, and found the young man dead, with a fearful gash across his face, which severed his tongue, his head almost separated from his body, and numerous wounds in other places. The murderers afterwards, with true Arab politeness, apologized to the consul for having committed the deed while he was in the village. The government, urged on by Mr. Wood, sent fifty horsemen to apprehend the Sheikhs; but they assembled their retainers, fired upon them, and drove them back. And, as we write these lines, we learn that another detachment sent since on the same errand, has just returned, defeated, to Damascus, with their leader mortally wounded. Yet these men are in the pay of government as the *protectors* of the road between Beirût and Damascus.

Our apprehensions were not lessened by a view of the village itself, and of such of its people as we saw. It is built in a strong position on the summit of a rocky ridge, and might be defended by a few resolute men against a large force. The people are like their country, wild and savage looking. The men we met at the fountain below, were all armed with long guns and large knives. We saw a number, as we approached the village, peering at us from behind precipices, and from the house-tops above. None, however, either spoke to or interfered with us; and so we passed on, well pleased to have escaped both insult and attention from a gang of murderers and rebels.

Descending the hill from Yüntah on the south, we came in fifteen minutes to an elevated and broken plain, having the range on which Yüntah stands on one side and a parallel but higher range on the other. We now travelled in a direction S. 52 W. along this plain. At 12.50 we saw a large village on our right, distant twenty minutes; but our guide did not know its name. It stands on the same ridge as Yüntah, from which it is distant about half an hour. Ten minutes further we reached a large circular pond, partially filled with water, and having on its banks a few stone troughs. Around this the plain is level, and has a

rich soil cultivated with care. Passing this we entered a rocky district, our stony path keeping close along the foot of the hills on our right, and winding among bare white rocks which painfully reflected the sun's rays. But having reached the top of a somewhat steep slope, a scene of beauty and grandeur, for which we were altogether unprepared, opened suddenly to our view. At our feet lay a fine plain some five miles long by three wide. In its centre rose a graceful little hill, its sides clothed with vines, and its top crowned with the village of Kefr Kûk. On its right ran a range of wooded hills rent by numerous valleys; beyond it rose the green slopes on which stand Râsheiya and 'Aiha; while on the left it was shut in by lofty hills, over the summits of which towered the snow-capped Hermon.

We descended and crossed the plain to Kefr Kûk, where we arrived at 2.20. Beside the village is a large walled pond of stagnant water, in which men, boys, donkeys and sheep were wading about in great delight. In the centre of the pond we noticed a fragment of a column, and, in some of the walls near it, a few well hewn stones. From an upright stone, which forms the side of a gateway, we copied an imperfect inscription.

We resumed our journey at 2.40, and rode down the southern slope into a part of the plain lower than that over which we had passed in approaching the village. This plain resembles that of Zebedâny in its form and in the richness of its soil. We found, also, by looking at our barometer, that it is exactly of the same elevation, namely, 3500 English feet above the sea. The village of Yûntah we had also seen to be of the same elevation as Blûdân, that is, 4860 feet. At 3.15 we had 'Aiha on the hillside twenty minutes on our left, and at 3.20 we began to ascend the slopes, the road leading through luxuriant vineyards; and twenty-five minutes after, we reached Râsheiya. We rode through the village and entered a picturesque valley on its east side, in which we pitched our tent beneath a large walnut tree. It was a charming spot, and, as the sun sank behind the castle-crowned heights, we sat on our carpets admiring the grandeur of the scenery, and enjoying the cool evening breeze.

We were visited by two interesting boys, grandsons of the Emir Effendi, a member of the princely house of Shehâb, and now governor of the district of Râsheiya. Having expressed a desire to obtain a good view of the adjoining country, they invited us to the palace, from the roof of which the most extensive pros-

pect could be gained. We gladly accepted their invitation, and at once set out. When we reached the palace, it was thought necessary that we should first pay our respects to the ancient Emīr. We were ushered into an upper room in which we found him seated at an open window which commanded a glorious prospect of the Alpine scenery around. He rose as we entered, and invited us to a seat by his side, and then, after the customary salutations, ordered pipes and coffee. He asked us if we intended to visit Hermon, and, hearing that this was our intention, he told us of ruins on the top, of which we had never before heard. He also assured us, in answer to our questions, that there were many bears on Hermon, and that, at this season, they destroy great quantities of grapes in the vineyards along its base. We inquired about leopards, and he said they were still found, but were not numerous. Taking leave of the old prince, we were accompanied by two of his sons to the summit of an ancient tower connected with the palace, called Burj er-Râsh. From this tower, they said, the village took its name. The whole country was now before us, and as the young Emīrs kindly told us the names of the several villages in sight, we took bearings of them all. Hosts of servants and retainers had assembled in the court-yard ere we descended, to see the strangers; and, as we passed along, many bright eyes were seen peering at us through the *jalousies* of the Harīm. As we passed by crowds of armed retainers, and saw the prancing horses gaily caparisoned, held by gaudily dressed grooms, we could not but think that were the costume slightly changed, the palace of Râsheiya would pass for an English baronial hall of five hundred years ago.

August 31st. Some time was required to fasten on our water-jars; pack our stock of provisions, including some baskets of delicious grapes, a *bakhshish* from a friendly *natūr*; and procure a guide to the summit of Hermon. All arrangements being at last completed, we mounted and rode off at 6.25. Continuing some three minutes down the valley in which we had encamped, we then turned to the left with our faces to the mountain-top, now beautifully pencilled on the background of a deep blue sky. The valley we had entered had its terraced sides covered with vines, while a few fig-trees were scattered over the hill-tops above. The valley conducted us into a pleasant little plain, the rich green of whose fruit-trees presented a pleasing contrast to the white cliffs that shut it in. At 7.15 we had reached a large

pond of clear water at the entrance of this plain. It is called Birket el-Yabiseh (the dry pond); but why, we could not determine, seeing our guide assured us that its supply of water was unfailing. We passed the plain in twenty-five minutes, by a path hemmed in by dense foliage, and then reached what may be called the real base of Hermon. We now struck up a ravine directly toward the top; but in some minutes afterward turned to the right by a zigzag path up its almost perpendicular side. The ascent now began in good earnest; but my strong Arab horse bounded onward with almost the lightness of a gazelle; though we had often difficulty in keeping our seat in the saddle. The whole way from this to the summit was difficult and laborious. There is no regular path, but our stalwart guide led the way, now following the track of a winter torrent, now scrambling along a shelving bank, and now zigzagging up the steep slope. The surface of the mountain is covered in every part with loose fragments of white limestone, resembling the sea-beach; but different in this respect, that, instead of being rounded, they are angular, and in many cases sharp as knives. As we advanced, the stones put in motion by the leader of the party, touching others below them, and these again giving of their impetus to others, the ripple would spread as it advanced till the whole hill-side around seemed flowing like a torrent, but with a strange rustling noise, to the depths below. Those in the rear were sometimes even endangered when a larger block became detached. At 9.20 we reached a natural cave, having lost half an hour in waiting for stragglers, and in gazing with admiration on the country far below, as each valley and plain opened up before us. Here turning to the S. W. we skirted the mountain side for twenty minutes, having the summit on our left, and then reached a small fountain.

There being no water higher up, we determined to halt here till evening, and then proceed to the top, and make arrangements for the night. Wishing, however, to see and explore as far as practicable the southern range, I mounted my horse, and taking the guide with me, proceeded around the hill-side. I soon found, that the ravines which furrowed the mountain, could not easily be passed on horseback; so leaving my horse with the guide to await my return, I set out alone. I crossed several deep valleys and intervening ridges, and came at last to a point where I could see, stretching out on the right far below,

Wady et-Teim and Merj 'Ayûn, with their continuation, the Hûleh; and on the left the elevated plains of Jeidûr and Jaulân; while before me, nearly due south, ran a lofty mountain-chain, though much lower than Hermon, toward Bâniâs. The whole of this chain, as seen by the eye and closely examined by the telescope, presented the same general aspect as the mountain on which I stood—white and naked rocks, with intervening slopes of loose white stones. The only signs of vegetable life were found in the small plains near the summit; and these consisted of but two varieties; a dark velvet looking moss which, springing from a single slender stalk, rises to the height of about six inches, and spreads over the ground like a circular cushion; the other, that everlasting drab colored prickly shrub one meets with in every part of the Syrian desert, and which seems as sapless as the stones from among which it springs up.

I examined with care the geological features of Mount Hermon. We had been informed before, leaving Blûdân, that Lieut. Lynch had passed over granite and other primitive rock, on his journey from Hasbeiya to Damascus. We had not his work at hand to refer to at the time, and consequently took the representation of his statement as accurate. On returning to Damascus, we found that no such statement was made in his book. In fact, he never speaks of granite at all, and accurately describes the mountain as composed of limestone. He does, indeed, say: "As we descended, the limestone rock disappeared, giving place to sandstone and trap; and lower down, *serpentine* occasionally cropped out." He must here refer to the spurs which run out eastward from Hermon, and not to the mountain itself. I have passed round about three-fourths of the base of Hermon, and have marked well the height to which the trap ascends; and this is pretty uniform. I entertain some doubts, however, about the accuracy of the latter part of the passage quoted; though it would be very difficult to disprove, as Lieut. Lynch has not definitely marked the places where he speaks of having seen it.

But to return. Leaving the spot I had now gained on the summit of the southern ridge, I turned my face toward the loftier summit, northward. An hour's smart climbing brought me to a peak, which was separated from a still loftier one to the north, by a valley some 200 feet deep, on the sides of which were deep banks of snow. Between these two peaks we after-

wards pitched our tent, and spent the night. I descended this valley to the place where I had left my horse, and returned to the fountain.

At 4.30 we mounted, and at 5.30 we stood on the loftiest part of Hermon. I shall not soon forget the feelings that filled my breast when I gazed on that magnificent panorama, which was spread out beneath us. I could scarcely realize the thought, that I now stood on that sacred mountain of which inspired penmen had sung in ancient days, and that the land of Israel, God's gift to their fathers, was at my feet. And yet it was so. There was Lebanon and Carmel; and Tabor and Bashan, with the Sea of Galilee between them. And there, too, was Damascus, with the Abana and Pharpar, its renowned rivers, meandering through its delicious plain. A thousand places famed for their power, sacred from their historic associations, and whose names were household words in my boyhood, in a far distant home, lay mapped before me. I stood long in pleasing reverie, looking abroad from that commanding height. The arrival of my companions, and of the baggage and servants, roused me at last.

Having issued our orders for the arrangement of the tent, and other necessary matters, we gave ourselves to a thorough examination of the several summits. These are three. The highest is on the northern side, commanding a view of the whole Bûks'a, with the ranges of Lebanon and Antilebanon on each side. The next is only about two hundred or three hundred yards south of the former, and overlooks the sources of the 'Awaj and the plain of the Haurân. There cannot be more than twenty feet of difference between the elevation of these peaks. The third is about a quarter of a mile west of the latter, and is that which I had before ascended from the south. It is, perhaps, 100 feet lower than the others. With considerable anxiety, I drew out and examined my barometer, thinking that now I would be able to complete, at the highest and most important point, the series of altitudes I had taken in the Antilebanon range. Great, however, was my disappointment, when I found that the index had got so entangled with the thermometer, that it could not retrograde sufficiently to mark the altitude. It stood fixed at a point which indicated an elevation of about 8500 feet. I resolved, however, in the descent to mark the time it should begin to act again, and thus estimate the remainder. In this,

too, I was sadly disappointed; for as I endeavored to make my way, at night, down a cliff, I fell and so damaged the instrument that I could not further rely upon it; and I have since sent it to England to be repaired.

On the second of the summits above referred to, we found some curious ruins. Passing over a rocky projection on our way to it from the first, our guide pointed out the entrance to a large artificial cavern, beside which lay a fragment of a column of limestone, and around it a number of hewn stones. As we ascended the peak, however, we found more extensive and interesting remains. Round a rock which rises to a height of some fifteen feet, are the foundations of a circular wall formed of stones of apparently great antiquity, but carefully hewn. This *ring* is about sixty yards in diameter. In the centre of it, and of the rock, is a rude excavation eight feet deep, open above. Within this enclosure, on the south, and on the very brow of the mountain, are large heaps of hewn stones; some of them beveled like those at the castle of Baniâs, and others with a well-cut moulding running along their edges. Here, also, I could trace the foundations of what appeared to have been a small temple. We saw no columns, and no inscriptions. The former, however, which would naturally have been placed in the portico, may have rolled down the precipice. I thought I could recognize two eras in these ruins. The stones of the temple seemed to be of a later age than those of the ring. But who were the constructors of these buildings, and what was the object for which they were erected? Some light may perhaps be thrown on these questions by a consideration of other circumstances. On three other lofty summits of Antilebanon, I also found ruins of very great antiquity, and each one of these, like that on Hermon, commanding a view of the desert along the eastern horizon. The circular enclosure I have not seen in Syria; but there is one somewhat similar on the top of Mount Greenau, in the north of Ireland, and this place is celebrated in Irish Annals as the great sanctuary for sun-worship. By the ancient inhabitants of Syria, places of worship were erected on the summits of mountains. These the Israelites were commanded to destroy when they gained possession of that land, Deut. 12: 2, 3. And again, when they adopted the worship and the gods of their heathen neighbors, they are said to have built them altars on every high hill, 1 Kings 14: 23. 2 Kings 17: 9, 10. The earliest idolatry was no doubt solar and

planetary; and in after ages the same worship was continued, but under different forms and emblems. A desire to approach nearer to the objects of their adoration, and especially to see and honor the sun on his first appearance along the eastern horizon, would naturally lead them to construct their altars and erect their temples in elevated situations. These facts may explain the singular circumstance of such ruins being found in such a position. I consider all these ruins, situated far above the dwellings and haunts of man, as not only remarkable in themselves, but well worthy of observation as illustrations and proofs of the truth of Bible history.

This, then, we may regard as one of the seats of ancient Syrian worship. The priests and votaries of Baal could here see their god, as his first beams reddened the desert sands; and they could follow him in his unclouded and glorious course till he sank into the still waters of the great sea. As we stood amid those ruins, in the very spot in the centre of that ring where, it may be, the sacred fire burned, and looked over hill and mountain far away along that line of gold, which gleamed and sparkled on the surface of the water, to the bright orb beyond, whose departing splendor illumined sea and sky, we could scarcely wonder that men, unenlightened by inspiration, should adore such an object. The setting and the rising sun, too, presented strange and beautiful phenomena from this point of view. A stratum of purple-colored haze ran round the whole horizon, clearly defined as the circle round a ship in the midst of the ocean. As the sun entered this, his shape was at once converted into a series of rings, arranged in the form of a double cone; then in a little time the upper cone disappeared, and the under one remained like a huge top balanced on the horizon; this afterwards gradually became flatter, and seemed to spread out, until at last it suddenly disappeared. But while we gazed at this picture in the west, that behind us eastward was not less beautiful. The shadow of the mountain fell on the plain away beyond, like a gigantic pyramid. Larger and larger it grew, until its top touched the horizon; and it did not stop here; higher and higher yet it raised its summit, beautifully figured on the sky as it had been on the earth, until, as the sun touched the water, it stood before us, a vast ærial pyramid, with its broad base on the earth and its top in the heavens.

When darkness had set in, we set fire to the dry prickly bushes

scattered over the mountain-top, and in a short time had the whole summit one sheet of fire. This was a signal of our safe arrival to our friends in Blâdân. As we left our *Baal-fire* to go to the tent, the moon rose. We were thus permitted to witness another splendid scene, as each hill-top and precipice was tinged with her silver light.

September 1st. The morning's dawn found us shivering on the mountain-top. The thermometer, which had been fifty-two degrees at sunset in the tent, was only forty-one degrees when we got up in the morning; and above, it must have been colder still, as a sharp biting wind was blowing.

My great object now was to examine the form of Antilebanon, which lay mapped before me, and to mark the sources of the 'Awaj, on the eastern slope of Hermon. The morning was clear, though white fleecy clouds hung over the plain of Haurân and the lake of Galilee. A sentence in the "Narrative of the United States Expedition," by Lieut. Lynch,¹ had formerly excited in my mind some doubts as to its accuracy, and now I was determined to test it. It is as follows: "From the summit, the country below which had seemed so mountainous to the upward view, appeared an immense rolling plain. Far to the north-west, at the verge of the seeming plain, were the red sands, a dazzling line of gold separating the luxuriant green of the plain from the light azure of the far-stretching sea. Upon that line of sand, like clustering dots upon a chart, were the cities of Tyre, Sidon and Beirût." "Another plain stretched from the opposite side, south to Haurân and to the east, until it was lost in the great desert." Statements like these may be pardoned in that romance of Eastern Travel, "The Crescent and the Cross," where they are also found; but in a professedly scientific work, undertaken for the advancement of knowledge, they are altogether inexcusable. The "seeming plain" is a pure fiction. The ridge of Lebanon north-west, must be at least 6000 feet high. The "red sands, that dazzling line of gold," which separated the luxuriant green of the plain from the light azure of the sea, existed only in the imagination of the writer. The bare white summits of Lebanon completely shut in the view on the north-west; and if Lieut. Lynch saw Beirût, or Sidon, he must have possessed a power of *clairvoyance*, which enabled him to look *through* some twenty miles of mountain. Southward and eastward there is a

¹ Page 482.

plain, but it is bounded and intersected by several ridges of hills. Nearly due east is seen the blue outline of Jebel 'Aghar. South-east the parallel ranges of Jebel el-Aswad and Jebel Māni'a run across the plain, separating Haurān from the Ghâtah; while southward the Jebel Haurān shuts in the view.

My object, however, was not to search for those distant places, which could only be seen dimly and indistinctly at the best, but to observe and sketch those nearer and more important, because less known. Seating myself, therefore, on the northern summit with the intelligent guide at my side, my compass on a rock, and telescope in hand, I commenced my observations, and wrote my remarks fully on the spot.

On the north-west the view is shut in by two lofty peaks of Lebanon, which I remember to have passed over two years ago in going from Jezzin to Jisr Būrghūz. In a line with these is the southern point of the Būkā'a, south of which rise rolling hills. A low ridge here separates the Būkā'a from another plain, which may be regarded as a continuation of Wady et-Teim. The ridge is broad till it reaches Jubb Jenin. Here the western part sinks into the great plain; but its eastern part is connected by a narrow neck with the lofty Tell on which is built Sultān Ya'kūb, and hence it continues in a series of Tells to Mejdēl 'Anjar, where it sinks down gradually into the plain near the fountain of 'Anjar, the site of the ancient Chalcis. I could see that from 'Anjar southward this ridge runs in nearly a straight line, and that the valley between it and the main mountain chain is clearly defined along its eastern side; except that, at Sultān Ya'kūb, there is a low ridge or swell running across the valley.

Along the eastern slope of the range alluded to, I saw and took bearings of the following villages, beginning from the south: *Kefr Meshky*, immediately on the north side of which a narrow gorge cuts through the ridge running about east and west. *Kaukaba*, on a partially isolated hill north of the gorge. *Muheidithēh*, *er-Rafīd* and *el-Bīreh*, close together and nearly due north; the last is in a line with Rāsheiya. *Jubb Jenin* lies behind the hills nearly over the first of these; and *Kāmid el-Lauz*, also behind the hill, about in a line with the third. *Sultān Ya'kūb*, *Mejdēl 'Anjar*. The last is not visible; but from my knowledge of the locality I could accurately determine its position.

On the eastern side of the plain above referred to, as running between this ridge and the main body of Antilebanon, I noticed

the following villages, also beginning from the south. They are almost in a line. *Beit Lehya*; *el-'Akabeh*; *Dahr el-Ahmar*, in a line with *Râsheiya*; *Khîrbet Ruhha*.

Eastward from this plain, or rather valley, begins a very rugged and mountainous district, with Wadys crossing each other in almost every direction. From *Râsheiya*, however, there runs a broken ridge to the western entrance of Wady el-Kûrn. This ridge forks near Yüntah to the south-west. The western branch is very broad, from one hour to an hour and a half; it is intersected by a Wady which runs from a little north of Yüntah to 'Aithy and Sultân Ya'kûb. It is intersected again by Wady Hureiry, which extends from Sahil Judeideh to Mejdél 'Anjar; and a little north of this, in part, by Wady 'Anjar. The other branch, running by Yüntah to Wady el-Kûrn, was before spoken of. The general features of this ridge are rugged and barren, in parts covered with thin forests of dwarf oak. The rock is limestone, but in one or two places are veins of sandstone.

On the east side of this ridge runs a broken and in some places rocky plain or valley. It can only be called so, however, in contrast with the mountains around. It begins immediately below 'Aihâ; passes Kefr Kûk; then rises somewhat abruptly several hundred feet, and also contracts, and has a gradual slope upwards to the east side of Yüntah, where it may be said to terminate; the high mountain chain which bounds the plain of Zebedâny on the west, after passing Wady el-Kûrn, forks here and shuts it in.

Between this place and the southern part of the plain es-Sahra, situated more eastward, there is a confused mass of wild mountains, which form the central and chief chain of Antilebanon. In form it is an irregular triangle, with Jebel esh-Sheikh for its southern base, and the village of Dimâs the subtending angle. It is united to the former, by the south-western branch of the Zebedâny range, which runs from Wady el-Kûrn, and joins it an hour and a half west of Dimâs, near the village of Deir el-'Ash-air. A lofty ridge running north-east a few points east from the summit of Hermon, bounds this district on the south-east; after running for about two hours north-east, this ridge turns east toward the plain of Damascus. The village of Rûkhleh I saw at the place where the ridge turns eastward, in a deep and seemingly wild valley, N. 60 E.

I now proceeded to the middle peak, from which alone the south-eastern slopes of the mountain are all visible.

On the southern side of the ridge last mentioned is a deep Wady, with sides in many places precipitous. My guide called it Wady Barbar, but I am doubtful about this name. Toward the lower part of it, where it opens into the plain, I saw the village Kūl'at Jendal, in which, as the name implies, there is an ancient castle, probably, as I have heard from one who lately visited it, of Saracenic origin. From the summit of Hermon there is a path, but steep and difficult, by this village to Katana; and this is possibly the road pursued by Lieut. Lynch and his party. South of this village rises a lofty peak, which is the termination of a spur that runs out from the mountain; and south of this again is a valley wider, deeper and longer than the former. It runs up into the very heart of Hermon; and from the spot on which I stood there is an unbroken descent, at an angle of some sixty-five or seventy degrees, to the bottom of it. The depth must be nearly, if not fully, six thousand feet, and yet it would seem as if one could throw a stone into the bosom of the valley below. The head of the valley sweeps round to the south of this summit, and is shut in, at a distance of some two hours, by a high ridge of hills, a spur from the southern chain of Jebel esh-Sheikh. In the bosom of the valley, in a direction S. 8 E. are a number of small fountains, whose waters unite beside the village of 'Aurny about half an hour below, and form a considerable stream, which, flowing past Er-Rimeh, el-Khirbeh and Bk'a-sem, enters the plain, and winds across it to Sa'sa'; it is the north and principal branch of the river 'Awaj. Its general course from 'Aurny to the plain is about due east, and from thence to Sa'sa', S. 20 E. The guide called the river Nahr 'Aurny, and the Wady in which it rises, Wady Bheirān. This, I suppose, is the tributary to the 'Awaj, which Mr. Thomson calls the "Sā-birāny" (Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. VI. p. 367). The village Beit Sābir, from which he says the name is taken, I did not see, nor did I hear this name applied to the river.

The exact height of Jebel esh-Sheikh, so far as I know, has never been ascertained, by barometer or otherwise. Russegger estimates it at 9500 feet. I am not aware on what data that estimate was formed, but I think it too low. If the snow upon the summit is to be taken as any guide, I would say that Jebel Sūnnin and Jebel esh-Sheikh must be nearly of the same height. I have observed them both, day after day, for two summers, in connection also with the peak at the cedars, as all three are

visible from Blûdân, and, judging from the gradual melting of the snow, the last mountain is evidently the loftiest, and Hermon ranks *second*. I know that this mode of calculation is liable to error, from the relative positions in which the mountains are viewed; but I make allowance for this. As seen from Blûdân the snow entirely disappears from Sûnnîn; but from Hermon never. We found snow in deep layers, in the ravines and sheltered places round the summit. The three summits of the mountain I have already referred to. The distance between the north and south extreme summits cannot be much over a quarter of a mile, certainly not more than half a mile; and from these there is a gradual slope on all sides. The ridge which runs south toward Bâniâs must be about, or nearly, 2000 feet lower than any of these peaks; while that which runs to the north-east, is about the same elevation as the other. It will be seen from this that the two peaks put down on the map attached to the "Researches in Palestine," cannot be quite correct. They are there represented as so far apart, that they cannot be those I have mentioned, and there must consequently be a difference in their elevation of almost, if not altogether, 2000 feet. The peaks above mentioned I regard as the true summits of Hermon. The ruin is called Kûl'ât 'Antar.

I have thus described, and I fear *usque ad nauseam*, Hermon and its environs. My apology is, I have felt interested in it. For more than two years I have seen it almost daily. Every feature of it, and of the noble chain that, shooting out from it, shuts in this old city, is familiar to me, as the home of my childhood. It is, moreover, an unknown land, and I wish to send a picture of it to the far west. Without a map, I fear it will be difficult, if not impossible, to follow and comprehend the minute details given. One object I have had in view in making these observations was, to construct a map of Antilebanon, and the country eastward of it to the desert. In this I have to a considerable extent succeeded, and I hope ere long to be able to complete it. As this work is pursued as a recreation, in the midst of many and pressing duties, its progress must be slow and also uncertain.

My companions being ready to mount, when my observations were finished, I rode off with them at 9.45. We descended toward the west, our path being both steep and dangerous. In an hour and a quarter we reached a small fountain on the moun-

tain side, called 'Ain el-Lauz, descending from which, through a wild ravine, we came, in thirty-five minutes more, to the bottom of the Wady which runs along the foot of Jebel esh-Sheikh from Râsheiya. Crossing it, we ascended a range of low, but very picturesque hills, which bound it on the west. Having surmounted this range, we came on the western brow to the brink of a lovely valley, shut in by well-wooded hills, and having the small village of Sha'tt in its bosom. As we passed through the gardens below the village, the rich grapes hung in festoons from the branches of the trees that overshadowed our path, while the fences on each side were almost covered with the tempting fruit. We reached the village at 1.10, one hour from the foot of Hermon. In another hour we passed through the village of el-Kufair; fifty minutes afterwards we reached Mîmis, and in an hour more were beside the palace of the Emîrs in Hasbeiya.

September 2nd. We left Hasbeiya at 8.5, and descended the ravine to the banks of the Hasbâny. Turning to the left, we followed its right bank to Sâk el-Khân, and the bridge below it. Crossing the river, we ascended a low range of hills on the left hand. At 9.20 we had on our left, distant fifteen minutes, Râsheiyet el-Fûkhâr, situated on the side of a well-wooded hill. Further north, and somewhat higher up, we also noticed Kufair Hamâm and Kufair Shûbeh. Descending into a picturesque vale, through which passes the track of a winter torrent, its sides fringed with oleander, and overshadowed by the sparse foliage of a grove of ancient olives, we passed on our right, at 10.15, the small village Khûreibeh. Another Wady similar to the preceding, but still more beautiful, ran across our path; and on its northern bank, some twenty minutes from us, on the right, we saw el-Mârieh. Our road now ascended to and traversed a plateau thinly covered with dwarf oak, and having a rich soil and luxuriant vegetation, though now burned up with the summer's sun. The broad plain of the Hûleh now opened up before us, with the lake in the distance, and the heights of Hunin on the west. Hunin itself was visible with its crumbling ramparts; and below it on the north we could distinguish the white threshing floors of Ibel, the Abel Beth Maachah of Scripture.

We entered the Hûleh at 12.20, and, forty minutes after, were sitting beneath a noble oak, beside the fountains of the ancient Dan, at Tell el-Kâdy. We spent nearly two hours wandering among the rank weeds and luxuriant herbage of this interesting

spot. An Arab encampment was spread around the gushing fountains, while hundreds of sheep, oxen and camels were scattered over the plain. The spot must have been a glorious one, and wonderfully fruitful, when the houses of Laish stood upon and around the Tell, and the whole plain teemed with waving corn.

From Tell el-Kâdy, an hour's ride through a forest of oaks, which covers this part of the plain and of the slopes on the east side, brought us to Baniâs, the Caesarea Philippi of the New Testament. We wandered long among its extensive ruins. The place, unlike most of those in Palestine, is not less remarkable for its classic associations than its natural beauties. There was towering mountain, and wooded hill, and battlemented height, and gushing fountain, and crumbling ruin, and wide-spreading plain, all finely blended in one glorious picture. As I stood and gazed I could not but remember that a greater than classic interest is attached to this spot. Its soil was trodden by the feet of the Son of God; beneath that frowning precipice and beside that clear stream, our Lord and his disciples have no doubt often sat; within those crumbling walls the lips of the Saviour of the world unfolded Gospel truth to men whose dust now mingles with its kindred earth; and perhaps on some one of those mountain-peaks above, Peter and James and John obtained a glimpse of the glory of the upper sanctuary in the Transfiguration.

As we sat in our tent, previous to retiring to rest, an armed retainer of the Sheikh was announced on business. Being introduced, he said the country was in a state of rebellion, the Arabs were near the village, and robbers of all kinds infested the neighborhood; his master, therefore, could not be answerable for the safety of our persons, or our property, unless we would pay a party of men to keep watch during the night. I replied at once that our persons we were prepared and able to protect; and that, as the Sheikh had, according to his own admission, the power to protect our property, I would hold him responsible for anything that might be stolen, but I would pay no man for keeping watch. We got no reply, and we lost nothing.

September 3rd. We were up by daybreak, engaged a guide to Beit Jenn, and started at 5.40. Our first point was the castle; and so leaving our muleteers and servants to follow by the ordinary road, we struck up the hill. In a hour we were within its

walls. Its great strength, vast extent, and beautiful workmanship, far surpassed my expectations. I examined this splendid monument of the pride and power of former days, as well as the ruins around the village below, with considerable care and much interest. I do not feel it necessary, however, to enter here upon any description of either.

Here I was on the borders of a wide district little known, and therefore interesting. It is true, many travellers have traversed this district, and by different routes too; but I have never been able to find any satisfactory information regarding it. Dr. Robinson has summed up in a brief note, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for May 1849, the whole that is before the public upon it. A perusal of that note will show that the country between Baniās and Damascus has hitherto escaped the notice of accurate observers almost wholly.

We left the castle at 7.15, and descended to the summit of the ridge, which connects the hill on which the castle is built with the mountains on the east. Here we had on our left a deep valley separating us from the mountain-range on the north; and on our right the hill sloped away gradually for twenty minutes down to the side of a deep ravine. At 8.5 we saw on our right, distant fifteen minutes, the village 'Ain Kūnyeh, built on the northern brow of the ravine; and on our left on the mountain-side opposite, distant about thirty-five minutes, Jubbāta. From this point our road led up the mountain-side in a direction a few minutes north of east, till we reached a small fountain called 'Ain el-Beidah at 8.30. Here we approached the head of the valley above referred to, as running along the castle hill on the north. Sweeping round it, through groves of oak and other trees, and over beds of mingled basalt and sandstone, we reached the summit fifteen minutes after leaving the fountain, where we had lost five minutes. An extensive and apparently well-cultivated plain was now spread out before us. In its centre rose a low hill, which, being connected by a neck of land with the hills on the west, completely shut out from our view the southern part of it. We could see the wooded heights that bounded it on the east and south. It is called Merj el-Yafūr, and is the joint property of Jubbāta and Mejdēl. We descended to the plain by an easy path, and followed a road skirting the hills on the north-west, leaving on our right another road which strikes across the plain toward Sahita. At 9.15 we came to a place where a deep

ravine divides the hills on our left, through which passes a road to Mejdél, distant about twenty minutes, but not visible. From this point we saw towards the south a fountain. It rises at the eastern base of the hill above mentioned as standing in the plain, and over it, distant about thirty-five minutes, a small white Wely was seen, called Neby Yafûr; immediately beyond which commences an oak forest, which extends over the whole hills southward as far as the eye could reach. On the borders of this oak forest, ten minutes beyond the Wely, is situated, as our guide told us, Birket er-Râm, the *Lake Phiala*. We could not see it from any part of our road, and I did not go out of my way to visit it, as I intended a few weeks afterward to travel by the route from Kuneitera to Bâniâs, and hoped then to see it. This position agrees in every respect with that given by Mr. Tipping, in his note to Mr. Smith. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. I. p. 13. He says: "It is about an hour and a half south of Mejdél." The difference in the estimated distance from Mejdél is easily accounted for by the rates at which different travellers ride. We were well mounted and could have accomplished the distance in a little over an hour, riding at our usual pace. It is south of Mejdél by compass; that is, allowing for the variation, S. 10 E. From this point we also saw the village Sahîta on the top of a hill S. 60 E., distant half an hour. The plain is oval-shaped, about an hour in length from north to south, by about half that breadth in the centre.

We now ascended to the high ground on the north of this plain, and at 9.25 reached the top, from whence we saw Mejdél fifteen minutes on our left, and rather behind us, and below it a small fountain. The road travelled by Burckhardt was different from that which we had hitherto followed; Burckhardt's Travels in Syria, p. 44 seq. He went from Bâniâs "behind the castle," by which, I suppose, he means on the north of it, to Jubbâta; and thence he followed the narrow valley, which lies behind the hills that bound Merj el-Yafûr on the north-west, to Mejdél. He could not, therefore, have seen this plain at all, nor the district around Lake Phiala.

We descended into a valley down which flows, in winter, streams from the fountain of Mejdél, and others, and here struck the road travelled by Burckhardt. Crossing this valley, which continues its course toward the south-east, passing on the north side of the hill on which is built Sahîta, we went up a branch

valley to a fountain called Ain et-Tin, which we reached at 9.45.

The greater part of the country which we traversed since we left Ain el-Beidah above the castle of Bâniâs, is volcanic. In some places the limestone still appears, and also sandstone strongly impregnated with oxide of iron; but basalt is the prevailing rock. Close on our left rose the lofty sides of the southern ridge of Hermon; one mass of white limestone. The country is wild and desolate, the hills rugged and of barren appearance, though, having a rich soil intervening between the blocks of basalt, they are to a considerable extent capable of cultivation. The whole region from Bâniâs to Beit Jenn was said to be very dangerous, owing to the hostile attitude assumed by the Druzes in opposition to the government. Both at Hasbeiya and Bâniâs attempts had been made to dissuade us from taking this route, and our guide, though well known in the district, seemed much alarmed. All the people we met were armed with long guns and daggers, and some also carried in addition swords and pistols. Their appearance was anything but pleasing; and never in this country, not even in the deserts of Palmyra, when enjoying the comforts of a Bedawy prison, have I seen such wild and fierce looking men. We were, however, a strong party and well armed; and we knew that Arabs would be very chary of attacking Franks under such circumstances. Our numbers and strength were still further augmented by two armed cavaliers, whom we found awaiting our arrival at Ain et-Tin. They had joined our party at Bâniâs, but pursued their journey thus far while we were examining the castle. Not deeming it safe, however, to go further without us, they stopped at the fountain till we came up.

We now ascended the hill on the east of the fountain and traversed an elevated plateau, the highest ground on this road. Descending a little from the plateau, we entered a little plain called Merj el-Hather, and reached a small fountain in it at 10.25, eight minutes after entering it. The water flowing from the fountain formed a pond or little lake, a few minutes on our right, and thence runs E. S. E. through an opening in the low hills, passing on the edge of the plain, and ten minutes from the pond the Druze village el-Hather. The plain is about two miles long by half that breadth. It is encompassed by low hills on all sides except the west, from which rises at once the side of Hermon.

There are extensive oak forests all around, now fast falling beneath the axe of the charcoal manufacturer.

I made particular inquiries about the names given to the great mountain-chain we were passing over; and the result of my inquiries was, that, while each little district is distinguished by a name of its own, taken from some village or fountain in the neighborhood, yet the great chain has two general designations, *Jebel esh-Sheikh* and *Jebel el-Heish*. The former name is given to the great range extending from a line joining *Katana* and *Râsheiya* on the north, to one joining *Bâniâs* and *Kuneitera* on the south. The continuation of the range south of that line is called by the latter name. I stated above, that from the summit of *Hermon* a lofty range of mountains runs due south, gradually but slowly decreasing in height as it advances. It continues in an unbroken line to *Mejdel*, where it at once sinks down some thousands of feet, as I would think, and then continues the same course along the eastern side of the *Hâleh*. About *Hather* a spur strikes out from the main chain, which, after running for some time a few points east of south, turns again and runs nearly parallel to the other, thus enclosing the *Merj el-Yafûr*; south of which the two join, and continue their course in a broad swell.

From the fountain we struck across the plain, leaving the ordinary road on our right. We had just commenced the gentle ascent on the north-east, when a wild-looking Druze, black as *Erebus*, met us, and asked our guide if the muleteers, now some way behind, belonged to us. He answered hesitatingly, and tried to evade the question. I, however, at once stated that they did. He replied, that if they had not been in the employ of Franks, they never would have left the plain alive. I inquired the reason for such treatment of travellers, and especially of poor men. He said that I was at liberty to walk over his fields and pluck his corn, but that if another did it the earth would drink his blood. I replied we were strangers and did not know the road; and, besides, if we had injured anything I would pay for it. He said, "You are an Englishman, and I am your slave. My fields are yours, and you have a right to all." Saying this he passed on seemingly satisfied.

A short time after, we reached a rocky plateau thinly sprinkled with dwarf oak. The guide informed me that this was the worst part of our road; and that travellers were frequently robbed and

stripped by wandering parties of Arabs. On this spot, some two years previous, I believe, a party of English travellers, with a lady in company, were attacked and plundered; and, after the usual Arab custom, stripped of every article of dress; and thus left to pursue their journey to Damascus as they best could. No such romantic adventure awaited us, and we continued our journey in peace.

On this plateau a road branches to the left, leading to 'Aurneh, and Kûl'at 'Antar on the top of Hermon. At 11.30 we reached the brow of a wide and deep valley; and, descending its southern bank, we turned, after reaching the bottom, into a wild ravine, through which runs the track of a winter torrent. Following this twenty minutes in its course nearly due east, we reached a spot at 12 where it passes into another ravine; and here at the point of junction stands Beit Jenn. Wady Beit Jenn is not dry, like that down which we came; a fine stream rushes down it, whose banks are lined with walnut and poplar trees. The fountain, I was told, is at the foot of Hermon, about one hour west a few points north, of the village. I was anxious to take such bearings as would enable me to fix this place; but, from the height of the rocky banks, I could see nothing but the direction of the Wady, which runs S. 75 E. This stream is the second great tributary of the river 'Awaj.

Leaving Beit Jenn at 1.10, we followed the course of the stream, passing in fifteen minutes 'Ain Beit Jenn, which springs up immediately on the right bank of the rivulet, beside a grove of trees. Its waters about equal those which flow down from the village above. We had here on our left the continuation of the lofty spur, which separates Wady Beit Jenn from Wady 'Aurneh. Twenty minutes below the fountain we passed out into the plain. Here are a few miserable huts used only for cattle, and called Mazra'at Beit Jenn. From this place the river runs in a deep channel, and winding, courses across the plain to Sa'sa', where it is joined by Nahr 'Aurneh. From this point I took such bearings as will enable me to fix this branch of the 'Awaj with considerable accuracy on the map. Mr. Thomson, in his journey from Damascus to Baniâs, passed this spot; but, instead of taking the road by Beit Jenn, he immediately ascended the southern side of the Wady and went over the hills to Hather. Beit Jenn is not "high up," as described by him; it is just thirty-five minutes from the plain, and has an elevation

of only a *few feet* above it (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. VI. p. 369). The plain between this place and Sa'sa' now looked bleak and blasted. Only the narrow bed through which the rivulet ran presented any appearance of verdure. Irby and Mangles, as well as Mr. Thomson, traversed this district early in the year; and, therefore, describe it as well watered, with numerous tributaries falling into the Nahr Beit Jenn. I suspect that if they had returned late in the summer, they would have found water a scarce commodity, and all the tributaries dried up.

Having lost ten minutes in making observations here, I rode after my companions, across the rolling plain at the foot of the hills, in a direction about north-east. At 2.30 I reached the side of a flat and very fertile piece of land, extending up among the hills on the left in a triangular form, and running down on the right to the banks of Nahr 'Aurneh. At 2.45 we had on our left, distant about half an hour, the village of Hineh, built on the western slope of a small Tell that rises at the head of the piece of land referred to. In ten minutes more, I reached the side of this small plain, and had, rising close on my left, the termination of a low spur from the mountain. Along its side was conducted a stream of water taken from the Nahr 'Aurneh, which was used in watering Hineh and the little plain below it. Following the same course, I reached Kefr Hauwar at 3.25. Here I ascended to the tower, mentioned by Burckhardt, and found that it is nothing but a small modern house. It may, perhaps, once have served as a Druze place of worship. The view from this place is extensive, and I took from it several important bearings. Sa'sa' bore S. 17 E. and Kesweh on the 'Awaj S. 82 E. Toward Haurân the country is one uniform plain, slightly undulating, with isolated conical peaks rising up at intervals. Some of these are crowned with Welys, while others are cup-shaped, evidently the craters of extinct volcanoes.

I had thus ridden from the banks of the Jennâny to Kefr Hauwar in an hour and a half; which will represent a distance of about six Roman miles. Burckhardt gives the distance at three and a half hours; *Travels in Syria*, p. 46. He says, also, that Sa'sa' lay one hour and a half to the right. The bearing of Sa'sa' from the entrance of Wady Beit Jenn is S. 73 E. In placing it on the map by these bearings and one from the summit of Hermon, I found its distance from Kefr Hauwar to be about five and a quarter miles. The Nahr 'Aurneh, the branch of the 'Awaj

referred to formerly, runs in a deep channel twelve minutes to the north-east past Kefr Hauwar; and from this continues its course, winding like a serpent, to Sa'sa', passing only one village on its way. Of this village I did not get the name, though I marked its position. It is strange that Burckhardt does not mention this important river at all, though he passed over it on a bridge between Kefr Hauwar and Beitma. *Ib.* p. 46. About half an hour north-west of Kefr Hauwar this river enters the plain.

From this place I was able to see, at one glance, the whole section of the plain watered by the 'Awaj. I was also able to look down the narrow Wady through which it passes between the low parallel ranges of Jebel el-Aswad and Jebel Mânia', on its way to Lake Hijāneh. From the foot of Jebel esh-Sheikh to Kesweh is about seventeen Roman miles; and the district watered by the 'Awaj is not *on an average* more than an hour in width. From Kesweh to Hijāneh is about fifteen miles; but the river is closely confined between two mountain ranges nearly the whole way. The whole arable ground, therefore, watered by this river, may be estimated at about sixty-five to seventy square miles; and yet Mr. Thomson makes the assertion that it waters *ten times* the arable ground that the Barada does; *Bib. Sacra*, Vol. VI. p. 369. From the fountain to the plain, the Barada is upwards of twenty-two miles long, and the arable land watered by it along its banks, averages at least half a mile in width. From Salahtyeh to the lakes is about twenty miles, and there is an average width of fifteen miles of this watered by the Barada. Thus the arable land watered by this river is about 311 square miles, or nearly five times that watered by the 'Awaj.

I have been more particular in giving these details, because I believe it is the first time the sources of the 'Awaj have been clearly pointed out, or its course described. I had formerly the opinion, that the river was comparatively an insignificant one; and was inclined, therefore, to doubt that it could be referred to by the proud Syrian of old. Now, however, I see that it is unquestionably the *second* river of Damascus. I have visited and examined all the other streams and fountains in this section of the country; and I am now persuaded that if Naaman meant *two rivers*, as is probable, and not *two fountains*, that the Barada and 'Awaj must be these two.

I believe that one or two very small tributaries fall into the

'Awaj from the country south-west of Sa'sa'; but I have not seen them and cannot verify it.

September 4th. We left Kefr Hauwar at 4.30, crossed the bridge over the river twelve minutes after, and rode up the north bank to the half-ruined village of Beitma, which we reached at 4.55. Our road now led over an undulating plain, having the foot of Jebel esh-Sheikh about an hour on our left. At 5.40 we crossed a very small stream running in the hollow of a deep Wady. This stream flows down from Wady Barbar, in which is the village of Kūla't Jendel. At seven o'clock we reached Katana. Westward of this village the plain runs up further into the mountain than toward the south; but is more elevated and undulates more. This western part of the plain comes in between the eastern ridge of Jebel esh-Sheikh and the low hills that bound the Sahra on the south-west. Through it is the road by Rūkh-leh to Rāsheiya. Katana is a large village with fine gardens and rich fields. It is watered by a stream which springs up a quarter of an hour west of the village. This stream does not flow eastward and cross the Haj road, as represented on Burckhardt's map; but is exhausted in the fields some distance below Katana.

We left Katana at 7.15, and proceeded in a direction more to the east than that we had pursued from Kefr Hauwar. Here is a fine plain which is now a desert, but only requires water to make it a paradise like the gardens of Damascus. At 8.20 we had the village of Judeideh twenty minutes on our right. At 9 we passed the village of Muaddemyeh, five minutes on our right, and soon after entered among extensive vineyards. Nothing could present a greater contrast than the two parts of the plain at this place, the portion watered and that not watered; the former rich and fertile, covered with luxuriant vines, now bending under the weight of the clustering bunches, and, further on the right, dense groves of olive and mulberry trees, encircling the large village of Daraiya; the latter, close on our left hand, a bare desert, parched and burned up by a scorching sun; while beyond it, white as snow and bare almost as a rock, rose the low range of Kalabāt el-Mezzy. Half an hour more and we were within the gardens of Damascus, pursuing our journey amid the most delicious groves; sheltered from the sun's rays by the thick foliage of the fragrant walnut, and having our ears regaled by the murmuring of waters and the voice of birds.

At 10.25 we passed through Kefr Susa, and at 10.45 entered the gates of Damascus.

We rode the whole of this day's journey at a very fast walk, and I should estimate the whole distance passed over in the six hours as twenty-four miles, viz. ten miles from Kefr Hauwar to Katana, and fourteen from thence to Damascus. Burckhardt's estimate of the distance is not at all correct. From Kefr Hauwar to Beitima he makes half an hour, and thence to Katana *four hours*. While from Katana to Kefr Susa he makes only three hours, and thence to Damascus one. *Travels in Syria*, p. 47.

While I pen these lines (October 5th, 1852), the district which I describe is the theatre of war. I had looked forward with pleasure to a proposed journey to the south of Palestine; but I can now scarcely venture beyond the gates of the city. The Sheikhs of Yüntah have seized the passes of Antilebanon; and an army of 14,000 men is employed in endeavoring to subdue the warlike Druzes of Haurân. I see little prospect of a speedy termination of these sad troubles. There is a weak, but tyrannical government; and a restless and discontented, but brave people. And these are elements which do not well agree.

Damascus, October 5th, 1852.

ARTICLE IV.

THE COMPARATIVE VALUE OF ENGLISH AND GERMAN
BIBLICAL SCIENCE.

By Charles A. Aiken, Resident Licentiate, Andover.

BIBLICAL SCIENCE is one of the legitimate fruits of Protestantism. The necessity of any high development of sacred learning will be practically conceded only where a free Bible is given to the people. Accordingly the world owes to Protestantism not merely a free Bible for all classes, but the cultivation of those means which shall open to any class a profound insight into the meaning of the Scriptures. Withhold the Bible from all but a small privileged order, and you remove, in great measure, the stimulus which shall impel the few to seek acquaintance with the import of the Bible. Why else have the monasteries in which was treasured all the learning of the dark ages, sacred and secular, preserved for us only such scanty and withered fruit? But Protestantism having given the world a Bible is under twofold obligation to make the gift available. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the great interpreter, it must seek to make the Scriptures intelligible to the masses; and, by teaching the true meaning and the right use of its gift, it must guard against perversions and abuses otherwise inevitable.

Then the church of Rome has ever relied less on the living word than on institutions and ordinances, which, apart from the word, are dead. Sacred science knows no more deadly foe than the spirit of Ritualism, under whatever ecclesiastical form it lurks. The Romish church is right in ascribing great efficacy to its forms and sacraments; but as *mere* forms, forsaken by the indwelling Spirit working in and with the word, they are efficacious only of evil. If this church has at any time put forth an effort to make the Scriptures more intelligible, it has been under the constraint of external pressure. In self-defence, or to maintain her self-respect and justify herself before an enlightened age, she must needs seem zealous for the promotion of an intelligent faith and a consecrated learning. But enthusiasm and proficiency in Biblical studies have always been an occasion of suspicion and jealousy at the Vatican.

Yet, for the services that Catholicism has reluctantly found herself compelled to render to Biblical learning, we tender grateful acknowledgment. We would not depreciate by a single iota the true merits of Valla and Erasmus, Simon and Calmet, Houbigant and De Rossi, Hug, Jahn and Van Ess. But if men like Mai and Mezzofanti had been Protestants, would not their prodigious learning have brought the cause of Christ more profit? And for our teachers in Biblical science must we not look, not merely of choice but of necessity, mainly to Protestant lands, and to Germany and England as chief seats of Protestant learning? The German and English language and literature were earliest consecrated by the Reformation, and the genius of Protestantism has ever found them most congenial.

It is proposed to inquire into *the comparative value of English and German Biblical science*. In defining our point of view we would guard against a twofold prejudice. The epithet "German," in any association with religion and theology, is received, by some good men among us, with the same shrug of the shoulders, which, it may be supposed, one might detect in a pious Jew when he heard the name of Nazareth. Others, as well meaning, deeply impressed by the superiority of German learning, and awed by the confidence with which Germans assume that "wisdom shall die with them," or, it may be, enamored of German liberality, quote German authorities as though that were decisive of all vexed questions. We need not profess to shun both these extremes, of superstitious antipathy and servile deference. We have to add, by way of explanation, only this, that we restrict the terms "Biblical science" to that department of theology whose province is to define and interpret God's written revelation.

It is worthy of remark, that the development of Biblical science has been for the last hundred years much more rapid in Germany than in England. Time was when Walton and Lightfoot and Mill and Usher and Selden were recognized authorities in their departments. But since their period few English names are to be found that are cited as authorities on the continent of Europe. The fact that there is no longer, as there then was, a common language for learned men, will in part account for the fact that the attention of continental scholars is so little called to the real merits of English Biblical literature. But must we not allow at least that we are no longer masters in this department of litera-

ture? Does not the prevailing style of our recent commentaries, for example, prove that Henry and Doddridge and Clarke and Owen still exhibit the fairest type of English exegesis? Whatever we have gained upon them, has been secured rather by appropriating and assimilating and correcting the results of German investigation than by original research. The impulse to the more important recent efforts of English Biblical scholars, has too manifestly come from Germany, to allow any denial that we have forgotten our former independence. Semler and Ernesti gave an impulse to Biblical studies in Germany to which no equivalent has been found in England.

It should further be observed, that Biblical criticism has been prosecuted most scientifically in Germany. True science loves order and method. Nowhere have the various departments of sacred science been so sharply defined, nowhere the prerogatives of each guarded with such jealous care as in Germany. The enthusiasm with which the general relations and proportions of science have been there discussed, has extended itself to the department of theology. We know of no good English work on what is called the *methodology* of the theological sciences, while in Germany this has become a distinct subject for the lecture-room, and a distinct department in literature. Practically we may be in the main following a just method, but this unconscious, unreasoning correctness should never claim the title of scientific accuracy.

The first problem to be solved by Biblical science respects the composition and history of the sacred canon. What are the constituent parts of the Bible, and how do these several parts authenticate their claim? What has been their history, severally and collectively? Then, what is the text of the Scriptures, and what is its import? What was the original record, what was its primitive intent, and what is its significance to us? The Romish church may seek an answer first and only through the answer to this other question, What has been the teaching of the church on these points? The church is thus exalted to sit in judgment on the word, rather than the word to be the judge of the church. But, as true Protestants, we protest against being bound by ecclesiastical tradition or any *textus receptus*. It may interest us, as a subject for historical inquiry, to learn the opinion of the church on these points. The concurrent opinion of great and good men may furnish us data or a valuable test for our own judgments.

And we may admit that a harmonious tradition establishes a presumption not easily overthrown, but we acknowledge no authority in human tradition. And the dictation of Protestant dogmatism is as irksome to us, and as baneful to true science, as any Romish assumption. We recognize as our competent teacher only the Holy Spirit, and claim to be, in our immediate responsibility to God, sole judges of the truth. We must think that Germany has been truer to this fundamental principle of Protestantism than England. Freedom and liberality of Christian science have been sadly cramped by the Romish affinities of the Anglican church. And English Calvinists have been slow to emulate Calvin in that free application of historical criticism to the Scriptures for which he was eminent above all the other reformers. That this should be the state of things in a church never more than half reformed, we can well understand; but that Calvinists should be so jealous of dissent from tradition admits of no justification. We apprehend that an examination of the literature of the Reformed and Lutheran churches on the continent, would show that the Lutherans, in respect to independence of religious inquiry, as in so many other particulars, are far more in sympathy with Romanism. In proportion to confidence in, and dependence on tradition, the necessity for and vigor of original research are diminished. The less intervention there is from whatever quarter between us, and the pure light of truth and the immediate teaching of the Holy Spirit, the clearer will be our discernment of the real form and substance of revelation. And we would protest against every view of the authority of the Scriptures, which would nullify that authority in case doubt be thrown on the correctness of the decisions of tradition. We refer mainly to discussions of the integrity, authorship, etc. of the sacred books. We may not be willing to go so far as Schleiermacher, and say "The Protestant church must claim to be still continually engaged in the more exact determination of the canon, and this is the highest problem for exegetical theology in the higher criticism." But we may never frown upon free investigation in this direction, unless we are willing to give ourselves up to be blinded and bound by tradition. The fact that Germany has exhibited lamentable instances of the abuse of this freedom, may admonish us to be cautious and circumspect. But it cannot forbid us the use of those means whose legitimate tendency is to define more clearly both the substance and the import of the Scriptures.

Biblical science enters next upon the determination of the form of the sacred text. The "textus receptus" must furnish a basis for our investigations. But it may no more bind us than the decisions of tradition concerning the canon may in their sphere. In the prosecution of this investigation there are requisite the patience, and diligence, and enthusiasm in research for which German scholars are proverbial. This department of learned labor has been almost by common consent assigned to the Germans. They have, since the revival of classical studies among them, furnished the world with the texts of Greek and Roman authors. And in the department of oriental literature they must bring out of the undisturbed archives of English and continental libraries their manuscript treasures. The determination of the text of the original Scriptures demands the same qualifications, with the addition of a profounder reverence. Some critics, forgetting the solemnity of their work, have exhibited a disposition to play with the sacred text. This levity and licentiousness of criticism we would ever and only rebuke. A critic may easily shape a text so that everything difficult or obnoxious shall be removed, and the record shall no longer tell us what the writer said, but what the critic would have said in his circumstances. But one jealous both for the honor of God's word and the prerogatives of Christian science, will ask only, What was the original form of the revealed word? However we might wish to have the record read, research must tell us how it probably did read. There may be such a conflict of evidences that we can only approximate to a sure result. But this probable evidence is all that the case admits, and there is only the more need of impartiality and discrimination. No trivial reason shall lead us to alter the record, yet no prepossession shall make us obstinately tenacious of the received text. Regard for sound presumptions and the "analogy of faith," must keep in check irreverent criticism. It were a grave misdemeanor to tamper with the text of Greek and Roman classics; that misdemeanor becomes a crime of darkest hue, when the word of God is thus trifled with. Moral qualifications being supposed equal, we would not demur to that common consent which concedes to the Germans preëminent natural qualifications for this department of Scriptural criticism. And the fact that we have been content so long to rely on German texts, proves one of two things,—that we are not competent to criticise the fidelity of

their work, or that they have in the main been true to its responsibilities.

We cannot wonder that our Christian public has been disposed to regard with some suspicion German inquiries into the composition of the canon and the text of the Scriptures. The decision of some Tübingen critics, that only five books of the New Testament (Romans, 1st and 2nd Corinthians, Galatians and the Apocalypse) are genuine, is rather startling. But these extravagances on the part of men who have little reverence for anything but their own opinion, ought not to repel us from prosecuting these departments of study. The origin and development of Christianity are historical phenomena, on which science must pass judgment as on the other phenomena of history. And those writings which profess to be the original and authentic records of the early Christian church are, as historical documents, to be subjected to the tests ordinarily employed. We believe that God has declared their divinity by evidences satisfying to every willing heart. Yet, when men have attempted to exhibit and define these evidences, the best intention has not ensured completeness and proportion in their representation. To unfold the system of these evidences is the work of Christian science. And though it may for the time appear that the enemies of revelation are quite as scientific and more adroit than its friends, though it must be conceded that the truth has suffered quite as much from false methods of defence adopted by its friends as from any direct attack,—we are only to discipline ourselves the more diligently, that there may be a more perfect correspondence between the convincing power of these evidences over our own minds, and the power of our exhibition of them. It must be admitted that, in the sphere of Christian science, our opponents, have an advantage over us, in proportion as it is easier to object and to destroy than to convince and to establish. And in attempting to determine the text of the Bible, what advantage in means have we over those who have no sympathy with the truth? And shall we be so unreasonable as to frown on all emendations of the text, as though the “textus receptus” were possessed of higher authority than any other revision? The wildness of some German speculations can be proved extravagant only by comparison with the results of true and perfect science, not by mere negations. The so-called “negative” critics must be met by a sound positive criticism, not by denying the propriety of all criti-

cism, and acquiescing in traditions unsupported, it may be, by a single evidence.

It were unreasonable to expect that a just positive criticism should be already as fully developed among us as in Germany, where evangelical theologians have so long contended with the destructive critics. Unless we judiciously avail ourselves of their experience, we shall need to learn the same lessons by passing through the same conflicts, perhaps in an aggravated form. That the Germans are in advance of us in these departments of Biblical science is as certain as that in other respects they may well learn of us. And unless we refuse to recognize the progress that Christian science has made in this direction, particularly within the last century, we must for the present submit ourselves to the guidance of the Germans, however cautiously we may choose to follow them.

Having determined the outline, and, so far as may be, the substance of the sacred text, we are next to seek its meaning. The universal laws of language guide our search. Science brings to our aid its learned apparatus. In proportion as the language is remote in its affinity to our own, claiming kindred with the conceptions of a remote age, and a people isolated among the nations of the earth, the more laborious and discriminating must sacred philology be. On the other hand, no literature stands related at different points to so many ages and nations. None demands, consequently, in the interpreter so varied or extensive erudition. No nation is so competent to guide us in these linguistic researches as the German. Among them the philosophy of language has been subjected to more rigid and protracted investigation than elsewhere. They have discussed more thoroughly than others the relations and classification of languages. Most that we know of comparative philology has been taught us by the Germans. Living and dead languages are alike living to them, if we may judge from the enthusiasm inspired in them by philology. It is in great measure to this enthusiasm that they owe their eminent success as philologists. They know no "dry questions" in philology; no relations of language are so remote or complicated, no investigation so minute or arduous as to repel or weary them; they luxuriate in the intricacies of linguistic research. And underlying this enthusiasm is an unequalled tact or aptness in entering into the spirit of a language and literature, and appropriating its peculiarities.

With their mental character and habits, and in their circumstances, these are their "practical" subjects, about which gathers all the exciting power of a practical interest. The same ardor characterizes all their studies in Biblical philology. But the very pride of learning begets a wantonness that often ensnares. There is an Epicurean science that is content only with the new and rare and elaborate. And the Germans are peculiarly susceptible to this seduction. In attempting to avail ourselves of their labors, we are often reminded that the critic brings to his work too much learning. It comes between him and his text. The simplicity and purity of his perception of truth are marred. His object being twofold, display of himself and discovery of the truth, he often fails of the latter. Ready as we may be to admit the superior erudition of the Germans, we may not follow them heedlessly, nor accept uninspected the munificent gifts of their philology. The very extent and profoundness of their learning often enable them to bring forward an imposing array of authorities to support what our Christian consciousness tells us must be a false opinion. Says one of them: "The most eminent Biblical philologist is for all that far from being a Christian theologian, if, with all his learning, insight into the peculiarities of Christianity is wanting to him."

The simple grammatical signification of a text is modified by its historical connections. Language, if it be the world's currency, has not for its coinage an absolutely fixed value. Our present definition of a word does not tell the whole truth, nothing more, nothing less, concerning its import at all times in all connections. Science studies, therefore, the varying phases of language. The past is made to react its life before us. To appreciate the changes produced in language by the progress of national development and decay, one must be master of history as well as of philology. And to deny that such changes have been wrought, merely because we cannot see them, is neither to the credit of one's manliness and honesty, nor for the interests of science and truth. And yet this is the only way in which some men, of no pretension as philologists, are disposed to meet those German critics, who, on the ground of peculiarities in style and idiom, have assigned to the composition of some books of the Bible a different time or place from that generally received. Whether these critics have judged rightly or not, this is not the method to decide. It should be remembered that the development of

Hebrew literature covers the changes of more than ten centuries. And the New Testament literature, though in its origin comprised within a briefer period, occupies a larger scene of action, and one in which different forms of civilization were in contact and in conflict. We are not to expect, therefore, that Moses and Malachi, David and Daniel, Peter and Paul will speak the same dialect. And though by a standing miracle uniformity of style might be secured, yet until we can see stronger reasons for the interposition necessary, we are not at liberty to assume it. Thorough mastery of the language is no doubt necessary to enable one to distinguish peculiarities of the individual from those of the age. But we may not deny the possibility of gaining sufficient familiarity with the language to make this discrimination easy. And if for this, among other reasons, one should declare himself convinced, e. g. that the Pentateuch cannot be all from one hand, or the product of one age, you can reasonably expect to satisfy him only by accounting in some other way for alleged peculiarities — not by summarily crediting all to his imagination. Before we reject thus absolutely the judgments of competent scholars, we may well acknowledge, most of us, our want of qualification to form an opinion at all on the philological question. Then, if we choose, we may suggest that great caution is necessary, that one may rely too exclusively on this one method of proof, and such other considerations as may commend themselves to our sober sense. But to deny all the progress secured in Christian philology during the last two or three centuries, and to assume that Luther or Calvin or King James's translators were infallible in their critical judgments, is a bold, if not a scholarly, mode of reasoning with a candid and honorable opponent.

We would hold converse with Moses, and David, and Isaiah, and Paul, and John, as with contemporaries. We, therefore, inquire into the circumstances under which each book was written, that we may catch the play of expression upon the face of the author. We would arrest the fugitive shades of thought which sensitively shun every eye but that of a friend. This delicate work demands peculiar natural sympathy or acquired facility. Some critics possess in a remarkable degree this sympathy with a particular author. Their mental constitution, their temperament, or the discipline of their experience may have qualified them to appreciate this author as no one else could. We

know that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." And yet we may ask: "Why did the Holy Ghost move them to speak when, where, to whom, and as they did?" These questions will ordinarily be answered to our satisfaction, if we inquire into the character of the author, the character and peculiar circumstances of those addressed. Then one in sympathy with the writer will see the significance of a thousand turns of expression and shades of thought to which an ordinary critic is quite indifferent. Is it not for this reason that we find so much satisfaction in Calvin's comments on Paul's Epistles, and Tholuck's on John's Gospel? The more profound and comprehensive this Christian experience of the critic, the more readily will he throw himself into the position now of the writer, again of those addressed. And yet do we not feel that particular men are made to interpret to us certain books?

But this natural facility may not dispense with the aid of cultivation. And the lack of it may be in part compensated by diligent discipline. To this end we would often revisit and sojourn amid the scenes with which we would become familiar. Christian archaeology must unlock to us its treasure-houses. Knowledge of national and personal history must supply the place of intimacy of intercourse. The power of appreciation which we thus acquire is, it is true, far inferior to the sympathy of constant companions and bosom friends. Yet it is not for that reason of no value. It does promote, if not ensure, oneness of interest. One's words as well as his deeds are correctly apprehended only in their connection with time, place and circumstances. These supply the inflection and emphasis which make the words live again. If acquaintance with the incidentals of a discourse, these external scenes and influences, will not make us one with the speaker, it will do far more to make us one with the hearers. If we cannot, through familiarity with these occasions of discourse, know what a writer would say, we may at least know better how his readers would understand him. We do thus become interpreters of their thought if not of his. It is said by travellers, that one looking from Areopagus even on ruined Athens, or from the Mount of Olives on fallen Jerusalem, appreciates, as he could nowhere else, the words uttered there. And the Germans have always been eminent for this power to reproduce those external relations which existed only once, and then determined the whole tone of the discourse. This is one

of their most eminent qualifications as critics, either of classical or sacred authors. This may in part account for the fact, which might otherwise surprise us, that our own Shakspeare and the Italian Dante have found nowhere more appreciating criticism than in Germany. English scholars have rarely estimated so justly the individuality of the sacred writings. They seldom show us, as the Germans do, that this thought could be so expressed only by John, that only by Paul. The English critic finds no difficulty in ascribing to David all the Psalms which bear his superscription; the German has so definite an idea of David, that he finds it easier to assign the superscription to a later age, than to believe that David could have written all the Psalms ascribed to him. The German may sometimes err, and so may we. True, this facility of the Germans needs only to forget the restraints of reverence and authority to run into gross abuses. They sometimes magnify and so distort individuality. This is strikingly manifest in some of the speculations of Baur and others, regarding the different types of doctrine in the early church. The characters of Peter, John and Paul, for example, are so different, that, unless the natural working of their minds was overborne by supernatural influences, they could neither see nor express a given truth or doctrine in precisely the same way. But these Germans say, that the peculiarities are so essential, that at least one or two centuries must have elapsed before Christian consciousness in the church could have passed through these various stages of development. They accordingly extend the time of the composition of the New Testament canon over two centuries, more or less, and admit, in all the New Testament, the genuineness of only a portion of Paul's epistles. Some may ascribe to this same disposition the peculiar readiness of some Germans to attack the integrity of certain books of the Old Testament. And yet, for the sake of avoiding the confusion introduced by these imaginary diversities, we would not recommend shutting the eyes to all real and essential differences. That would be dishonoring the Bible as well as our own judgment and common sense. Not only are the Germans sometimes not content with appreciating the demands of time, and occasion, and individual character; they often forget the unity of the Bible. They treat it as a collection of books rather than as one book, and seek to make manifest their diversity rather than their unity. They sever the bond which makes all one. In the process they

sacrifice the vitality of the Scriptures. They bid "the eye say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; and again, the hand unto the feet, I have no need of you."

Grammatical signification, as modified by historical connections, is further defined and restricted by the peculiar nature of the sacred text and the "analogy of faith." Up to this point in our investigation, the peculiar nature of the Scriptures, as differing from every other subject of criticism, has exerted only a restraining influence. Now we come to consider not merely the form but the substance of the inspired text. Penetrating beneath that which is common to the Bible with merely human productions, its human element, we approach the confines of revelation. We have already insisted repeatedly on the necessity of reverence in the critic, as he discusses even the most superficial questions involved in his work. And we have had occasion to modify our commendation of the eminent qualifications of the Germans, as philological and historical critics, by calling attention to their proneness to forget the restraints imposed on them by the peculiar nature of their work. Nor would we imply that the sacred writers performed part of their work merely as men, at a certain point passing into a new sphere of thought and action. In all their work they spake as "holy men of God moved by the Holy Ghost." They were still men, and there was a human element in their action, which our criticism must recognize. The processes of our investigation must be in the main the same as though they laid claim to no inspiration. Otherwise, the Bible might as well remain in the dead languages, provoking no earnest inquiry, only to rebuke us in every stage of our investigation.

English Biblical scholars have not professed to disregard this human element; yet practically they have often refused to apply the same principles of investigation as in other similar cases. They have criticized the Bible as though it were of no account who wrote it, or where, or at what age of the world, or for what primary purpose it was written. Consequently they have often mistaken the true sense of the Scriptures. This has been a consequence of the form in which they held the doctrine of inspiration. The individuality of the inspired writers is often virtually destroyed by theories which intend no such result. Hence one of the best tests of the theory may always be found in its application in interpretation. As a single illustration, notice the manner in

which different critics discuss apparent discrepancies in Biblical narratives. Some weary themselves and you by their painful efforts to force into manifest consistency passages apparently irreconcilable. Their artifices disgust men who are not prepared beforehand to sympathize with such a procedure. The implication is, that an apparent discrepancy weakens, if not destroys, the force of all the other combined evidences of the Divine origin of the Scriptures. The work of Biblical criticism is degraded, if the main effort of commentators is to be spent upon this class of details, rather than in bringing out the great truths of revelation. It is said, and with apparent reason, by evangelical scholars in Germany, that a prime cause of the rationalistic movement of the last century, was the rigid, formal orthodoxy of the preceding age. Men could not believe that this was the true dignity of Christian science, and in the reaction went to the extreme of liberality in interpretation, and consequently in every other department of theology. It would be easy to point out, in Germany as well as in England, instances in which the importance of recognizing the human element in Biblical criticism has been undervalued. But the tendency has predominated rather in England than in Germany. We have not yet experienced, in its full extent, the rationalistic reaction which will in all probability be needed to bring us nearer the golden mean.

But the value of the human element may be over estimated. The sacred writers are men, but they are inspired men. The English critic is apt to forget that they were men; the German that they were inspired. We speak only of the tendency characterizing the Biblical critics of each nation. It will be said that, if we depart from the extreme of strictness, we know not where to stop. Very true; especially in the case of one who has been accustomed to rely implicitly on authority and prescription rather than on a faith disciplined by the Holy Spirit. Those who are deterred from any movement in the right direction by "not knowing where to stop," will find themselves safest in the Romish church, where every item of belief and every required duty is appropriately labelled, for the benefit of those weak in the faith. It is easier to put faith in the church and its confessions and formulas, than it is to discern and follow the guidance of the Holy Spirit. There is a class of Protestants in Germany, very decidedly Romish in their sympathies, whose chief reliance, when all argument fails them, is, that a given

interpretation or explanation has been that of the church. Hengstenberg may be taken as their best known representative. But this is to us a very unsatisfactory mode of reasoning, wherever we may find it. We like better Luther's sentiment: "What Christ does not teach is not apostolical, although Peter and Paul may teach it"; again, what Christ teaches is apostolical, although Judas, Annas, Pilate and Herod should do the same."

We have spoken of the analogy of faith as modifying our "grammatico-historical" interpretations. This idea is briefly expressed in the motto: "*Scriptura sua interpres.*" Each part of the Bible throws light on the interpretation of every other part. But by the "analogy of faith," the German critic too often means merely correspondence with established notions in philosophy; the English, conformity to some favorite creed or dogmatic system. In other words, the German too often finds the norm with which he will compare, and by which he will modify the simple, obvious sense, in some philosophical system; the English scholar, in his system of speculative theology. Kant's pupils, Schleiermacher's, Hegel's, can be easily recognized from their interpretation of passages at first view beyond the reach of their peculiar theories. And how many of our commentaries seem to have been written for the purpose of supporting peculiar theological opinions? "*Ne inferas sensum sed ecferas,*" is a maxim that should rebuke both these tendencies. Every mind, mature enough to pursue to any extent the work of an interpreter, will of course bring to that work philosophical and theological opinions already considerably matured. It is more essential that our philosophical opinions be somewhat fully developed, for they are in a scientific view more fundamental. Yet one may err by bending everything to a favorite philosophy. This has less of the air of religious reverence about it, than to thrust constantly upon our notice theological opinions; yet it involves perhaps quite as much of the reality. The philosopher may be as devout in investigating and applying the laws of his science, which presents God's truth as revealed in the laws of mind, as the theologian. Indeed, the more constantly and needlessly the interpreter exposes the peculiarities of his speculative belief, the more we distrust his sincerity and impartiality as an interpreter. This method inverts the true relative position of exegesis and dogmatic theology. From the half interpreted Scriptures the analogy of faith is deduced, and is then applied in all further exege-

tical labors. The chief object of an interpreter thus disciplined, will be, by the exercise of his ingenuity, to find in the Bible the greatest possible support for a system of belief stereotyped before he knew much of the real import of the Bible. In this way, an endless variety of systems have been imposed upon the Bible, with very little genuine exposition on the part of their advocates. And this is the chief reason for the multiplication of sects, all professing to trace their origin to the word of God. And we do not see how the evil will be stayed until men love the truth with enough singleness of heart to bring church confessions and creeds into due subordination to Biblical science. Dr. Chalmers's strong sense and love of truth are indicated in this remark: "It is putting catechisms and confessions out of their place to look on them as magazines of truth. There's some of your stout orthodox folk just over ready to stretch the Bible to square with their catechism; all very well, all very needful as a landmark, but what I say is, do not let that wretched, mutilated thing be thrown between me and the Bible."

There are German as well as English critics who have fallen into this error. But it is much more common in Germany than in England and this country to find commentators who do not consider their peculiarities of theological opinion as the great truths of the universe. And the facility with which many Germans pass from one school of philosophy to another, shows us how superficial their speculations are. On their theories they can easily create a universe, and as easily destroy it. Opinions so lightly held cannot exert the deep, all-controlling influence exercised by opinions held as tenaciously as ours usually are. It is much more frequently necessary there than here to procure the different editions of an author's works, in order to keep pace with his changing opinions. The analogy of many a German's faith would be inconstancy itself; or, if it be fixed, it is only in its negative character. The Holy Spirit only can teach the true analogy of faith; and while we would not insist that all shall exhibit one type of piety, we cannot be blind to the fact that many German critics lay no claim to Christian faith.

In exhibiting the results of their investigations, English Biblical scholars have ordinarily manifested profounder reverence for the word of God. We have already had occasion to notice the same fact, as manifested in the course of their inquiry. Few German works in Biblical science have been written on bended

knees. The processes of investigation have not been conducted with so constant a sense of the sacredness of the work, and the manner in which the critic communicates his opinions is too seldom different from what it would be in other departments of science. A chief reason for this has been, that the office of critic and commentator on the Scriptures stands in relations quite different from those which it sustains in England and here. In Germany, theology is to the great majority even of scholars, nothing more than one of the departments of science, inviting all whom natural tastes, education, or any other circumstance may incline to devote themselves to it. This is a consequence partly of political relations, partly of the connection between Church and State, and partly of the decline of practical piety during the last century. Many men are thus led to devote themselves to theology as a science, who have no sympathy with its themes. The number of those who are thus professionally interested in theological studies thus comes to be very considerable. Many men, who, among us, would find a more congenial sphere of action at the bar, in politics, or in some form of practical enterprise, are in Germany forced into a literary career, and, unfortunately for theology, too often into the department of Biblical criticism. Such men may be enthusiastic and successful, so far as their work is purely scientific, but it is often painfully evident that their interest is only intellectual. Then the duties of the pastoral office do not prevent the pastor's devoting much time to literary labors. Indeed, in some instances, much more time is given to the public than to the pastor's peculiar charge. A large proportion of the theological literature of Germany owes its origin to the learning and literary zeal of the clergy. This were well enough, if it did not imply neglect of pastoral duty, and consequently lack of the practical experience which ought to attach a peculiar value to the literary labors of a faithful ministry. It is true of all departments of theology, and especially of Biblical criticism, that they are not successfully cultivated scientifically, when they are cultivated only as abstract sciences. A learned and earnest ministry may make contributions to theological literature such as can come from no other source, but all this advantage is sacrificed where the ministry is only a learned profession, and the pastoral office a sinecure.

In England speculation has been far more uniformly tempered by familiarity with the workings of Divine truth. Profound per-

sonal experience has rebuked all mere theorizing. Then study has sought for a word to be preached, fit to be preached, and effective when preached. Yet we can claim this only so far as the word of God rather than ordinances has been relied on as chiefly instrumental in regeneration. Wherever, and in proportion as the preaching of the word becomes a secondary thing, Biblical criticism loses not only its chief stimulus, but the most valuable test of its soundness. There is not only less occasion to engage earnestly in Biblical studies, but also less opportunity to prove the correctness of our understanding of the word. The word is "quick and powerful," but so soon as we put ourselves in a position where its efficient working becomes to us a thing of no account, we can no longer be sure that we have the true key to its meaning. By far the greater and more valuable part of our theological literature has come from men who have been for a longer or shorter time faithful and evangelical preachers. We have no class of men who are theologians or Biblical critics only by profession. That theological literature which has grown up out of the pale of church establishments, is for these reasons most apt to be vigorous and healthful.

Then in England strong practical sense has prescribed objects and modes and limits to research. Study has a more definite, practical aim. There are not so many books written merely for the sake of writing. One is astonished to see what an amount of literature appears in Germany only to be forgotten; enough everywhere, but in the department of which we are speaking, relatively far more there than here. This might be expected in view of the facts already noticed. And in every department of German theological literature it is surprising to see how much learning is lavished upon inquiries that could hardly have occupied us except in our reveries. Elaborate inquiries are instituted into what are to us most unpractical or indifferent subjects. And men grown bold in their inquisitiveness, ask questions to which no man could, without presumption, expect an answer. And a speculative temper is indulged with complacency and in security, for no practical experience will ever be likely to bear one way or another upon the point at issue. Such intellectual exercises may be interesting and exciting when there is no more earnest work to engage attention, but we do not like to spend our enthusiasm to so little profit. Biblical criticism is less exposed to the encroachments of this mere speculation than some

other departments of theology; yet, where the tendency is so strong as in Germany, even this will not escape.

One of the common tests of the value of a commentary among us has usually been its practicalness, and this has been judged of, perhaps, too exclusively by its adaptation to excite pious feeling. The German distinguishes much more strictly between commentaries for scholars and familiar practical expositions. A commentary which is to any considerable extent occupied with the discussion of critical, historical and doctrinal questions, must appeal mainly to the intellect. Then if truth be sought and reached, the heart will receive its healthful stimulus. But the "practical reflections" the German reserves for a distinct class of works. The methods of investigation and the style are so distinct in the two cases, as to forbid their combination in one work, on any scientific principles. Thus De Wette, in his commentary on the Psalms, confines himself to the simple exposition of the text; while in another work "*Ueber die erbauliche Erklärung der Psalmen*," he gives his views upon the use to be made of the Psalms for the edification of Christians. These practical expositions have formerly occupied our scholars much more than the German, and in this department of exegetical literature we are comparatively much richer than they. Every commentary should commend itself to a Christian's conscience and enlightened heart, but whether it should make its appeal primarily to pious feeling is quite another question.

German Biblical science is by far the more stimulating and suggestive. Bengel, De Wette and Tholuck may be cited as a few among many possible illustrations. No one can read a paragraph in the works of either of these writers without finding food for thought. Bengel's brief notes in the "*Gnomon*" suggest more new and rich and practical trains of thought than whole pages in many commentaries. Probably De Wette is intellectually more exciting, for besides the freshness and vigor with which he expresses his own opinions, he opens to view the whole history of interpretation. Tholuck's genius and fervid piety impart a glow to his expositions such as we should not know where to seek besides. These are not men who write merely to astonish us by their learning, nor do they withhold the exhibition of it when a difficult point demands elaborate discussion. The mental constitution of the German and his habits of study open to him in great richness and variety new views of

truth. Then "new" and "heretical" are not to him synonymous terms. No morbid public sentiment frowns upon the publication of what is new and original in any department of theology. He regards church confessions and organizations as still open to improvement, and the interpretations of the Fathers and Reformers, excellent as they may be, as less than inspired. He never has discovered the warrant by which the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were authorized to fix the opinion of the church for all coming time. One may then be earnestly and conscientiously seeking the truth, who is unable to find satisfaction in anything that men have hitherto accomplished in the various departments of theology. There is, undoubtedly, a danger in this independence. One ambitious to attract attention in a field in which so many able and learned men are laboring, can do it much more easily by some novel and startling pretention, than by unusual breadth and profoundness of attainment in a legitimate direction. And, where the number of those devoting themselves solely to literary pursuits is so large, there will naturally be a profusion of these extravagances. A thousand eyes will watch the course of a comet, when the clear shining of an unpretending fixed star attracts but few. It is an evil that in Germany so much unconsecrated genius and learning are forced into the department of theology. Were it not well for our Biblical science, if more of the consecrated minds and hearts of England and America had equal opportunity to expatiate in the broad fields of sacred learning? It is an evil anywhere that the talent of a land be shut up to science and speculation. But among us a thousand correctives to extravagance exist, that can be found nowhere else. With a more extensive discipline, and ampler materials at command, might not sterling English sense and our profounder religious experience render unequalled service to sacred science? Most of our scholars are under the constant restraint of arduous official duties, and, therefore, in mere learning will not soon be able to vie with the scholars of Germany. But in adapting the results of learning to our necessities, the Germans can never meet our requirements. We must maintain an independent scholarship, while yet, in many departments, we must, for a long time to come, submit ourselves to the instruction of the Germans. Anglo Saxon mind was not made for dependence in any department, and we find many encouraging evidences in the present, that American and English Biblical

scholars are disposed to vindicate for themselves an independent position. Alford and Tregelles are prosecuting with independence and vigor the work of textual criticism; Davidson is laying us under great obligation by his labors in the department of historical criticism (the Germans say without always acknowledging fully his indebtedness to them). And our own Robinson is quoted as authority by the Germans in the department of Scriptural geography, probably more than any other living English author in any department.

It will be seen, that, in our estimate of the comparative value of German and English Biblical science, we cannot assign a decided superiority to either. Each must be supplemented by the other. As an illustration of the rare blending of the distinctive excellences of the two, we may perhaps be allowed to point to the late Prof. Edwards. Those of us who had opportunity to observe his methods of study and instruction, must have admired the German patience and enthusiasm and discrimination with which he labored for large and accurate attainments, his German liberality and independence of opinion and quickness of insight into sacred truth, the sterling English sense which presided over all his investigations, and the reverence which he always manifested toward the word of God. His example, and that of his predecessor and colleague, Prof. Stuart, might teach some among us that German Biblical studies are not necessarily and only pernicious in their influence. Prof. Tholuck cites Stuart's Commentary on the Hebrews as among rationalistic expositions of that Epistle. We would quite as soon call Tholuck a rationalist, were it not so unjust to attach the epithet in any obnoxious sense to either. Such men, be they German or English, we are proud to acknowledge as teachers, and we can only wish that there were more to emulate their labors in Biblical criticism.

ARTICLE V.

VIEWS OF TRUTH PECULIAR TO CHRISTIANITY.

By Seth Sweetser, D. D., Worcester, Mass.

THE determination of the views of truth which are peculiar to Christianity, demands, almost necessarily, a previous consideration of the truths which are peculiar to revelation. For the inquiry, in its scope, is not limited to the doctrines or religious truths which distinguish the new dispensation from the old; but aims to determine what is distinctively Christian truth, as given in the New Testament, compared with religious truths, found anywhere else, within the range of human knowledge. Only a small portion of the world have enjoyed a written revelation. But without this limited circle, much knowledge of Divine things has been found in every age, and numerous correct ideas of duty have been entertained. To what extent this knowledge is traditional from earlier unwritten revelation, and how far it may have incorporated into itself the ideas which had their origin in the Jewish or Christian Scriptures, cannot be easily determined. The strong presumption is, that the notions which prevailed among oriental nations of a Supreme Deity, and which, in connection with many superstitions and human inventions, were communicated to the Greeks and Romans, were derived from those, who, in the early history of the race, knew the true God as their Creator and Sovereign. The successive modifications which these notions underwent, give considerable force to the opinion, that a knowledge of the one true God preceded the gross forms of polytheism and the refined ideas of an elevated philosophy. From whatever source the primitive idea may have been derived, it is certain that men and nations, who have not had the written word of God, have arrived at many just and impressive conceptions of the Deity, and established many rules of duty in harmony with those of the Holy Scriptures. In order to determine what truths, or what views of truth, are peculiar to the Bible, it is necessary to compare the ideas taught in the Bible with those which are found elsewhere. In making this comparison let us consider,

1. The notions held concerning God. In the Old Testament, God is distinctly announced as the one living and true God. To him is ascribed the creation of the world. He is the sole governor of the universe, the disposer of all events in providence, the one lawgiver. The various natural and moral attributes of the Deity are clearly exhibited, presenting him as omnipotent, omniscient, infinite in holiness, goodness and truth. He is a just God, a merciful God; kind and compassionate, regarding with paternal affection all the intelligent subjects of his kingdom. The unity of God is made especially prominent, and contrasted strongly and variously with the idolatrous notions prevalent among men. It is a pure system of Theism, allowing not the slightest departure from the strict idea of one God only, supreme on earth and in heaven, and alone entitled to the homage and adoration of men. God is distinctly an individual, not an abstract power, not an undefined cause, not a principle in nature or the animating spirit in a material universe. The personality of God, his independent existence, his individual spirituality are most rigidly declared. He is the antagonist of all pantheistic, material or polytheistic notions. The force with which these peculiarities are expressed, seems evidently to have been designed to meet the necessities of mankind at the time the revelation was given, and to check the tendency to idolatry and superstition. There is a manifest tendency in the Old Testament Scriptures, to reëstablish and fix the knowledge of the living and true God, which had become so greatly obscured, or had been lost sight of. The teaching of the Old Testament, in relation to God, proceeds from this one idea. In passing into the pagan world, we at once meet with a different set of ideas. A conception of God, some notion of a Supreme Being, is found, perhaps we may say, everywhere. Connected with the grossest forms of Polytheism, the germs, at least, of the idea, that there is one God, are easily distinguished. This idea enters, with various degrees of clearness, into different religious systems, until it comes to be a well-defined spiritual idea in the minds of the gifted and deep-thinking philosophers, who earnestly struggled to comprehend both themselves and the universe. They taught that there is a Supreme Deity, who is to be worshipped and prayed to; who governs the world by his providence; who imparts knowledge, and presides over the actions of the intelligent creation. Plato, Seneca and Socrates, with a surprising depth and

clearness of intellect, uttered many profound and truthful sentiments respecting Divine things, and exhibited an understanding enlightened with striking views of God and his attributes. The idea of God is not, then, peculiar to the Bible. Nevertheless, the most erudite and acute philosophers mingled gross errors with the truths which they taught. They did not reach the simple idea of one only God, entirely and alone God, without connection with or any likeness to, any other God. The supreme ~~manen~~ of philosophy and of poetry, was only the greatest of the gods. He was the highest, the creator, he alone self-existent, king of kings, the father of men, and his existence defended by much the same arguments drawn from the order, fitness and beauty of material things, as are now used; but he was not God alone. Other inferior, subordinate beings, were also gods, so that, in the language of Cudworth, throughout the whole world "there is one agreeing language and opinion, that there is one God, the King and Father of all, and many gods, the sons of God, coreigners together with God." Without a written revelation as their guide, a very high and enlightened Theism was maintained as the speculation of philosophic minds. They reached these admirable notions by reconstructing and refining the fragmentary knowledge which they gathered from books and traditions, while, at the same time, the clear processes of reason which they adopted, justified their lofty conclusions. And, if the truths which they grasped, had not been obscured and weakened by associated errors; and had no polytheistic or pantheistic ideas been incorporated with them, philosophy might with much justice have vindicated its claim to a true knowledge of God.

2. We next consider the relations which were recognized towards God, with and without a revelation. It at once strikes the mind, upon surveying the two aspects of mankind, that, in one, the knowledge of God is with substantial authority, with the other, it is an almost powerless inference. The philosophers, whose researches were most profound and whose statements were most explicit, had no certain testimony. They proclaimed the being of God upon the authority of their own reason. It was with them the result of a nice and far-reaching speculation. From God they had received no communication, and such belief as they had, was so without sanction that, after all, it was little more than a bare, inoperative conception. They had ideas of God, notions of God, but not a substantial knowledge of God.

But in revelation God communicated himself, addressed himself to his creatures, uttered his law with awful sanctions, and the living and true God, in the absoluteness of his authority over men, was distinctly made known. Thinking men among pagans admitted that God was the lawgiver, but the people had no positive and authoritative knowledge of his law. Divine requirements and prohibitions were never understood so as to command the will and conscience. In the best forms of religious opinion, it was declared that men should submit in all things to the will of God, as the highest liberty. But this will was never explicitly known, nor was it known how God would deal with those who violated his will. It was a remarkable notion of the Stoics, that nothing was to be done without reference to God; and it seems much like the teachings of Scripture, when they say, that we are to trust in God and rely upon him, praise him as the author of all good, address all our devotions to him, and implore his assistance against temptations. These are Biblical ideas; and yet, as they stand upon no other authority than the conclusions of superior intellects, they have but little force. A revelation sets forth the exact relations of man to God; it is an authoritative director to obedience; it gives law precisely, in the name of God; it teaches from God, how God is to be worshipped, and what course of life he would that men should lead. It is doubtless true, that men had a consciousness of separation from God. But without a revelation they were unacquainted with the method of reconciliation with God. A great design, fulfilled by revelation as a whole, is, opening to men a way of pardon. The heathen mind was sadly in the dark on this important subject. Some faint glimpses they had concerning God's forgiving sin. They cherished some inadequate ideas of pardon. Still, they were profoundly ignorant of the way of peace with God. They were stung with a sense of guilt. They trembled before incensed deities. They brought sacrifices and offerings to altars consecrated by superstitious fears. They sought relief in expiatory rites and in solemn ceremonies. But no sweet promise of pardon had diffused joy in their sad hearts. The most refined speculations concerning God, and the relation of his creatures to him, afforded no practical solution to the weightiest problem of life. One message from the throne of Jehovah, one promise of mercy distinctly announced with its intelligent conditions, would have been of more worth than all the collected wisdom of the Grove

and the Porch. While cultivated minds cherished so many shadowy and unsettled notions respecting Deity, they could not teach the vulgar those necessary truths on which peace with God depends. They were left in a night well-nigh rayless and hopeless. "Across this night philosophy flitted on like the lantern fly of the tropics, a light to itself and an ornament, but alas! no more than an ornament of the surrounding darkness." Most strikingly in contrast are the vivid and luminous expositions of the Bible, revealing a God whose most illustrious attribute is mercy, and who delights in forgiveness upon known and settled conditions; pointing out to us our duty, and defining, with admirable clearness, the important relations of men to their Creator.

3. The views entertained in respect to the immortality of the soul. The germs of knowledge on this subject are almost coextensive with thought and reflection. Pagan systems generally imply, if they do not express, the notion of a future existence. Philosophy, in its speculations upon the immortality of the soul, has presented some of the proudest evidences of its strength, and reached some of its happiest conclusions. It has not, indeed, lifted the veil of futurity and dissipated its gloom. It has not fixed and delineated the position and character of the soul in another life. But, while it really settled, beyond question, no one truth of the doctrine of immortality, it did much to meet and encourage the unquenchable yearnings and aspirations of the mind. It accomplished all that could reasonably have been expected from the limited and infantile struggles of unaided reason. Even the Old Testament does not give all the light which the immortal aspirations of men crave. It is reserved for the more perfect revelation of Jesus Christ to bring life and immortality to light through the Gospel. And, moreover, the views entertained in regard to the condition of the soul in the immortal life, without a revelation, are insufficient and unsatisfying. It was declared that God would punish sin. Some taught that sin would be punished and that virtue would be rewarded in another life. But with how much childishness of fancy, and with what grossness of imagination these ideas were reduced to form, is too well known to be adduced here. It is eminently a distinction of revelation, to instruct men definitely in regard to a future state, and its condition, and the relation which its happiness or misery bears to this life. The teachings of the Bible transcend all human conceptions in regard to these vital points in religion,

insomuch that all the knowledge the world ever had without it, may well be considered as nothing.

4. In regard to the resurrection of the dead. The doctrine of the resurrection of the dead does not rest upon such evidences as sustain the belief in the existence of God and the soul's immortality. For the support of these, reason discovered many substantial and convincing arguments, and the human mind has always been profoundly exercised upon them. Much more sparing are the notices of the other. The resurrection of the body is a fact which can be settled only by a distinct revelation. The heathen world furnishes some speculations on this subject, but hardly anything more. Though some learned men have assumed that it was a fixed article of belief under the Jewish dispensation, the evidence of the Old Testament together with the information gathered from the discussions which arose during the ministry of Jesus Christ, lead us rather to conclude, that the resurrection of the dead was maintained by some, while it was denied by others. It is highly probable, that those who had any ideas upon this subject, did not advance beyond an undefined, perhaps a conjectural, opinion. It seems rather to have been a probability resting upon insufficient proof, than a settled faith.

5. If we compare the moral knowledge abroad in the pagan world, the notions so beautifully expressed by poets, and uttered so eloquently by orators and wise men, with the teachings of the Bible, we shall find a very remarkable correspondence between them. It has been said, and perhaps with truth, that almost every social duty, almost every moral sentiment, and even every Christian virtue which adorns the Holy Scriptures, can be found in the literature of the heathen world. To so great an extent is this true, that we can hardly claim for the Bible any great preëminence in the inculcation of a pure morality. It is not to the point, to say, that these acknowledgments among the heathen of the excellence of virtue, were only verbal, and lacked the force of those practical illustrations which are the highest teachings of morality. As moral truths they were largely admitted; as practical rules they were almost universally neglected. They wanted a Divine sanction, an authoritative enunciation; but the propriety of the conduct which they demanded, was in harmony with the best exercises of the moral sense of mankind. The elements out of which an admirable

life might have been formed, were certainly not wanting in the heathen world. But they were elements uncombined and unexemplified. They were not reduced to a code. They were never uttered with the voice of authority. No tables of stone had come down from the thunders and flames of Sinai, engraven with the finger of the Omnipotent. No Ebal, appointed of God as the mount of the curse, raised its frowning brow to warn the disobedient; no Gerizim, alluring with the blessings of the same God, confirmed the faith of the righteous. In the Bible, "thus saith the Lord," gives weight and impressiveness to every commandment or prohibition. Conscience is stimulated by the thought of the Sovereign who is jealous for his law. A sense of right, with no one to punish wrong, is a feeble restraint. A perception of virtue, with no rewarder of righteousness, is an insufficient allurements. And, therefore, the heathen world, notwithstanding its sound maxims, its wise precepts, its luminous and beautiful sentiments, the energy with which wrong was denounced, the glowing pictures of innocence and virtue with which it abounded, was still deeply sunk in the filth and wretchedness of debauched manners and allowed vices. Seldom were the virtues exhibited in life as the fruit of the eloquent teachings of their wise men. The tone of society was constantly lowered, and wickedness progressed with but little restraint from the theories of morals or the requirements of religion. They needed a distinct knowledge of God upon the throne, both lawgiver and executor. The moral sense needed to be confirmed in its dictates by the sentence of a coming judgment; and all the passions and propensities of the heart, to be held in check by the prospect of a final retribution. And because the theories of morals in the heathen world were separated from these sanctions and supports, they were practically powerless.

In this brief and limited inspection of a field so extensive and so full of interest, it will be seen that the elements of religious knowledge, the germs of the highest and most important truths, are discoverable where a written revelation is unknown. But in most respects they are only elements and germs. The world had notions, undefined ideas on many subjects relating to God and duty, which were of value. But the principles of morality, as well as higher speculative truths, existed only in a fragmentary condition. They were scattered in various productions of different minds. They were mixed with the crude devices, the

wild fancies, the absurd theories, the gross mistakes, and the ignorant conclusions of a dark age. And, although by careful selection over a wide field one might bring together many choice specimens of wisdom, and collect much excellent instruction which might serve for the direction of mankind, yet no one heathen mind ever digested the principles of morals into a system, or arranged religious truth so as to present it in a simple homogeneous form. So that, notwithstanding glimpses here and there, thoughts which seem to have glowed with a celestial fire, principles which are admitted even under a Christian dispensation to be sound and satisfactory rules of life, yet men really had no repository of truth to which to resort, no standard by which to try themselves. Everything was loose, unsystematized, disjointed. Even the knowledge of God, the relations we hold to Him, the immortal life of the soul and its conditions of misery or happiness, and the resurrection of the body, these great truths were never, independently of a revelation, so understood and received, as fully to impress and control the human mind. Revelation, in its enunciation of truths common to it with pagan systems, does present them with a fulness and decisive utterance, which not only makes them a substantial part of knowledge, but invests them with imperative claims upon the conscience and the heart.

Having considered the character of the knowledge of Divine things in the two conditions, with and without a written revelation, we proceed to inquire into what is distinct in the New Testament as compared with the Old. Religion, so far as it may be considered as determining the moral character of an individual, is the same thing under both dispensations. We have the same God and Father, to whom is due the supreme love of the heart; we are to approach him with penitence and faith, and to serve him with all the mind and strength. The same moral elements constitute goodness, the nature of holiness is the same, and righteousness is predicated of substantially the same life. Whatever belongs to the state of the heart in order to a reconciliation with God, the same subjective feelings, wrought in us by the Word and the Spirit, are common to both. The same moral law is the guide of conduct. Sin is the wilful transgression of the law. Many formal acts are required in the older system which are discontinued in the later. The form in which truth is presented, is adapted to a lower state

of intellectual development. The elementary ideas which are common to the two, are not brought out with equal distinctness. The relations of truth to conduct, the development of the spiritual life, and the symmetry of the character of a man of God, are by no means exhibited with equal clearness and fulness. Love to God is the basis of religion in the Old Testament. It is equally the basis of religion in the New. But, in the former, the objective truth concerning God is presented under severer outlines. For the sake of impressiveness, the most intense and glowing descriptions are given of the terrible attributes of Jehovah, those competent to alarm and startle hearts which are under the influence of the sterner and rougher passions of our nature. Interpositions of God are made with striking boldness and nakedness. The power before which men tremble, power applied to the production of physical results, is exhibited, to reach minds which are unspiritual and sensualized. It was a necessity of the case. The revelation of the old dispensation was given to men of the same intellectual and moral natures as in after times; of the same inherent susceptibilities, alike free in their wills and accountable for conduct. No principle was involved in God's requirement which is not eternally binding upon his moral subjects. But being then sensual in heart, with but sparing intellectual culture, and having strong tendencies to materialism, unchecked by abstract views of truth, the manner in which God and duty were presented necessarily conformed to the existing conditions of the human mind. The later dispensation is placed upon a higher level. It throws off the material form. God retires more from the direct and palpable connection with events. He is represented in the refined spirituality of his nature, and in the more tender and attractive attributes of his character. His worship is withdrawn from the symbolic and ritual modes, to the higher exercise of communion and heartfelt adoration. Without an altar, without gifts and sacrifices and a priesthood, the incense of a loving soul is presented as the most acceptable service. But the character of God, in the Old Testament and in the New, is really the same. There is no discord or contrariety in the two views; and, although a lower spirituality than is now expected, gave efficacy to the formal service, yet the offering of the heart to God in pure and holy affections really constituted the inherent worth of both. The New Testament meets the wants of humanity as they exist in all their variety, and

adapts itself to the human race in all the possible progress it can make in intellectual development. It retires from the formal, and expresses, in the simplest mode, the spiritual elements of the religion which God requires. Without a change in its nature, the manner in which it is presented and the motives which are pressed, are in many respects different.

The same comparison holds true in regard to the relations of men to each other. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, was the basis of the required intercourse between men. In the New Testament we have the same fundamental principle. We do not find any new doctrine. And if, under the practical requirements of the one system, there are acts tolerated which the other seems to discard, the inconsistency will be harmonized, by referring to some more general principle which involves both. Thus certain retaliatory acts which Christ disallows, were admitted into the Mosaic code. In the teachings of Christ, the directions are given as consistent exemplifications of the universal law of kindness. The permission was granted of old, under the necessary law of self-defence and of just punishment, which were indispensable in a rude and unformed state of society. Injuries affecting persons and lives must be restrained. Under governments with but feeble and imperfect organizations, the power which otherwise is entirely delegated to rulers, resides partially with the people. They are to an extent the necessary executive. The order, the peace and happiness of the community is the great end to be attained. The better way of securing it is by mutual forbearance, the forgiveness of injuries, and returning of good for evil. The execution of penalties is most wisely lodged in the hands of the executive. But when there is neither energy in the government nor the self-restraints of moral culture in the community, the primitive laws which are essential to protection and safety, are needfully in force. And hence the Mosaic code, instituted in a rude age, for a passionate and sensual people, exposed to all the vicious examples of insolent barbarity and unrestrained violence of surrounding ferocious tribes, almost of necessity embraced rules of cogent and severe application. But none of these rules can be construed into the admission of radically different principles in the required conduct of men. They do not refute the idea, that morality and religion in their elements were the same thing in both systems; that God delighted in substantially the same feelings and affections in the hearts of

men, formerly as now, and that a real goodness of character was built upon substantially the same basis. The moral law embraces all the great principles of social welfare. It defends the personal rights and secures the personal happiness of each member of society. It is designed, not merely to restrain violent acts, which disturb the repose of the community, but to extinguish those evil passions, which are the internal springs of wickedness. There is a spiritual energy and application in this code which makes it the code of mankind in all ages and all situations; and, although its higher and more comprehensive aims were not discovered by the bigoted Hebrew, yet, under the luminous expositions of Christ, its length and breadth and depth are convincingly illustrated. This code was the basis of duty under the old dispensation; it is the basis of duty under the new. Our Saviour fully adopted it, when he said: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

While this common ground of fundamental principles in the Old and New Testament, seems to be a fact to be admitted without controversy, there remain very many points of difference in which the revelation made by Christ and the apostles is distinguished from that of Moses and the prophets. However strongly the teachings of the Gospel now throw light upon prophecy, and with whatever advantage we read the Gospel by reason of a knowledge of the law, it can be shown that the New Testament discloses facts, and develops truths, which the human mind had never before perceived, or if perceived, had not clearly known.

Let us first consider what is known in regard to God. We have seen the full and explicit testimonies given to the unity and personality of the Deity. The Jehovah of the prophets stood revealed in the awful majesty and almost loneliness of the unapproachable Supreme. Respecting the Divine nature as involving a Trinity of persons, though it may be implied or dimly intimated, no declaration is made. This is a distinctive doctrine of the New Testament. The fact that God existed as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is not coeval with its enunciation. Nor is the knowledge of this fact necessarily connected with any acts of the Divine being, which imply such a peculiarity in his essence. As we trace the history of God's hand in the recorded events of

his church, we presume that we see distinct evidences of the work of the Son of God, as the angel of the covenant, and of the Spirit of God, as the teacher of his prophets and the sanctifier of the spiritual Israelite. To our minds, already enlarged with other views of the Divine economy, it may be easy to perceive that God, in many of his interpositions, before the advent of Christ, did still communicate with men in the person of his Son, or in the person of the Holy Ghost. Is there decisive evidence that the fact was recognized? Does the Old Testament contain proof, that the people of God had the conception of a Trinity in the Divine nature? Looking at the question in a merely speculative view, the immediate conclusion is, that it would have been very difficult to communicate the idea in definite terms without danger of its degenerating at once into that of a plurality of gods. The pure Theism of the Old Testament was the essential antagonist of the gross polytheism of a corrupt and material age. The world was full of deities. There were gods many and lords many. The divinity was distributed among innumerable supernatural existences. If God had been declared then as existing as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; if it had been said, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," and the "Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us," how could it have been possible, with the crude and uncultivated minds of the age, already accustomed to the idea of a multitude of gods, to have stopped short of the conclusion, that the Father was the true God, and that the Word was another true God? There certainly would have been reason to apprehend, that one great design of the revelation given by Moses and the prophets, and in fact of the whole Jewish economy, would have been subverted by such an enunciation, as that "the Word was with God, and the Word was God." One most important and, indeed, a chief end of the ancient revelation, together with the Jewish institutions and ritual, was, to establish the knowledge of Jehovah as the one living and true God, in opposition to, and in distinction from, the imaginary gods and deified heroes of the pagan mythology. The unceasing influence of idolatry in obscuring this idea, was the occasion of the successive judgments of God upon his people; and, as a historic fact, the existence and absolute preëminence of Jehovah was only firmly fixed by the long and severe discipline experienced under the theocracy. Until this was accomplished, the

appropriate time for the more perfect revelation of God and the deeper facts in his nature, had not come. The question, however, is not to be settled by a speculative argument, but by the facts in the case. It is not uncommon to assume that the Holy Spirit and the Divine Saviour are both revealed in the Old Testament. In justification of the known existence of the Holy Spirit, it is adduced, that many acts are ascribed by the prophets and inspired writers to the Spirit of God, or to the Holy Spirit. The term Holy Ghost is confined to the New Testament. To us, who live under the dispensation of the Spirit whom Christ promised, and who have known that there is a Holy Ghost, it is entirely natural to connect with the phrase, the Spirit of God, and Holy Spirit, the same idea in the Jewish Scriptures as in the Epistles. To our minds it has a definite meaning. We understand it as the third person of the Holy Trinity. The usage in the Old Testament does not necessarily imply such a knowledge. It is sometimes a term convertible with God. Sometimes it means a Divine influence. It is the exerted or manifested power of Jehovah. It is either God himself or an agency assumed as the medium of the Divine operation. There is no positive evidence, that the Spirit spoken of in the Old Testament, was recognized, either as a mode of the Divine existence, or as one of a trinity of persons in the Divine essence. It was either a name of God himself, not indicating any peculiarity in his nature, or the expression of the Divine energy as it produced results in the material world or enlightened and directed the human mind.

In like manner, the Son of God was not known in his mysterious unity with the Father. Our Saviour teaches us to search the Scriptures for testimony concerning himself. And we find in the Hebrew Scriptures many express allusions to him. The prophetic declarations and glowing descriptions of the Messiah, have found their fulfilment in Jesus. They are ample testimony to the identity of his person with the one who was to come. And however clear it may be to our minds, that many of these passages are consistent with the absolute divinity of Christ and of his coequality with the Father, it is by no means evident that they conveyed such an idea to the Jews. It is not, indeed, to be affirmed that the devout prophets of God were wholly ignorant of the spiritual character and offices of the Messiah. David did in spirit call him Lord, and he may have seen in vision the

Divine glory of Christ's person. Others by the same special gift may have enjoyed the same sublime privilege. There are passages in the Psalms and in Isaiah, which, to our minds, are emphatic descriptions of a spiritual deliverer and a Divine Redeemer. Neither would it be safe to assert that, in the early communications of the Spirit of God, no intimations had been given of a mystery in the Divine nature, or to maintain, with confidence, that devout Israelites, under the inspiration of God, had not some visions of the true glory and character of the Messiah. God certainly did communicate such facts to their minds, and through them to his church, as can be fully understood and appreciated only by recognizing the divinity of Jesus Christ. This form of the revelation was essential to a record to be read in all ages. In no other way could the unity and harmony of Divine revelation as a whole, have been maintained. It was necessary to the full establishment of the claims of the Messiah to his place in the Godhead, that the voice of prophecy should be in unison with the more full announcements concerning Jesus to be made in a later dispensation. We go to the Old Testament for proof concerning Christ. It is a witness to his Deity which cannot be impeached. Its testimony is strong and convincing, now that Messiah has come. But we are not, therefore, to conclude that, antecedent to the verification of the prophecy, its full force was discovered; that, before the actual person of Christ was known among men, his whole character was made out, and all his transcendent features and attributes moulded into the glorious image of the Son of God. The Hebrew Scriptures, read in their independent obscurity, and without the solvent for their almost enigmatical intimations, which is furnished by the New, would scarcely enable the most sanguine mind to discover, in the promised one, the fulness of the Godhead. Certain it is that no decisive facts can be adduced to show, that the Hebrews ever obtained from their Scriptures a well-defined spiritual idea of the complete character of Jesus, or were led to expect him, as a king, possessing the attributes and enjoying the throne with God himself. God did, however, disclose enough concerning his Son to awaken a high expectation concerning his coming, and to fortify the minds of devout men with the hope of a future deliverance from the evils under which his people were laboring. Their ideas were probably very vague. The oriental imagery under which the glories of his kingdom were predicted, fore-

shadowed a splendid and beneficent sovereign, who would bless the Jewish nation with great prosperity, safety and peace. But the intimations of the manner in which this was to be accomplished, are very sparing; and nowhere is it indicated, in language sufficiently exact to convey the idea definitely, that the Messiah was really the God of the Jews, or the Son of God, equal in all Divine attributes with the Father. It is quite certain that, when Christ appeared, even those who knew him most intimately, were not prepared to appreciate him in this exalted and mysterious character. The near disciples of our Lord were constantly exhibiting the darkness of their minds, and the narrowness of their conceptions, in regard to the person and character of their Master. And the idea seemed with slow progress to have gained their credence. Whatever the New Testament discloses of the Divine character of Christ and his mysterious union in the Godhead, is plainly a new revelation. It was opening to the human understanding a fact in the Divine nature, which had before been veiled in darkness. God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, may have been the essential condition of the Infinite Being from eternity. In the creation of the world, and in the government of the moral universe, each of these mysterious persons may have been exerting their peculiar agency. In the Jewish economy, each may have entered in the various interpositions and manifestations of the Deity. But the wonderful and transcendently mysterious fact never arose in its clear radiance upon the human mind, until the great purposes of God in the accomplishment of human redemption were fully disclosed. Then, the Divine character of Christ, the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person, appears. Then, in connection with his life on earth, he illustrates his omnipotence and reveals his union with the Father.

From him, too, comes the knowledge of the Holy Ghost, who was not manifested as the Paraclete until after the resurrection of our Lord. And by these revelations we gain all that, in the present world, we can conceive of a Trinity in the Divine essence. The knowledge of God thus subsisting, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is due to the light shed upon us in the Gospel.

In affirming that the doctrine of the Trinity, or of God existing in three persons, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is peculiar to the New Testament revelation, it must not be included in the assertion, that no doctrine of a Divine Trinity was otherwise

promulgated. The notion, that the Deity involved a Trinity, is of very early origin. Traces of it are to be found in many of the most ancient mysteries, so ancient that it has been called a "revealed theology." Its highest and most elaborate form is found in the writings of Plato and his school. As Plato wrote four hundred years before the Christian era, his views must be considered as purely human speculations, even though he caught the first notion of his theory from a dim tradition, derived originally from the Hebrews, but afterwards lost from among them. The similarity between the Platonic and Christian Trinities is certainly very striking. The Highest Good, the Intellect and the Soul, of Plato, are presented to us as the One Divinity. These three hypostases are exhibited as an extension of one essence. They are each eternal, and uncreated, and unsubstantial. This Trinity is not a threefold manifestation, nor yet a merely nominal Trinity, formed by different notions of the same thing, but an actual Trinity of persons necessarily existent and universal; infinite, omnipotent, and creators of the whole world. With these ideas others were variously mixed, partaking of an entirely pagan character, and different authors presented the leading facts with many confused and incongruous speculations. Now, while the purest Platonism discovers to us a system bearing so strong a resemblance to the Christian Trinity, and proving, beyond all dispute, the possibility, that the human mind can entertain the idea of a Divinity in a Trinity of persons, it must be evident, that this is not a true knowledge of the essential mode of the Divine existence, as given to us in the Scriptures. This Trinity of persons, while it is together affirmed to be the Divinity, is nevertheless a Trinity of mutually dependent and subordinate beings. The second was dependent upon and subordinate to the first; and the third, dependent upon and subordinate to the other two. It has more the appearance of an emanation or a development, than of the coequal persons of the Christian Trinity in one Godhead. The infinite goodness, the infinite wisdom, and the infinite love or active power, are very unlike the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And with whatever admiration we are struck, by the exceedingly lofty and acute speculations of Plato, and by his seeming apprehension of the necessity of conceiving of the Deity as not a simple Unity, we are still compelled to admit, that the only knowledge of the actual subsistence of God in three coequal, coeternal, omnipotent and

omniscient persons, together one and the same Deity, and yet without a tritheistic individuality, is purely a doctrine of the New Testament. The notions which have been adduced as preëxisting, and variously involved in older systems than the Christian, are important facts in the history of human thought. By a foreseen and wise concurrence of events, God prepared the way for the advent of Christ into the world. Not less has the providence of God been visible, in the preparation of the mind for the doctrines which cluster around Christ, as the incarnate Word. The speculations of philosophers, in regard to a Trinity, may be looked upon as an important influence, in preparing the way for the true doctrine of the Divine nature, while they all fall very far short of the doctrine itself. They are to it less than the morning twilight to the brightness of the sun. They are only coruscations, which shoot up in the night of pagan darkness. In the gloom they are brilliant and attractive. They vanish, when the sun of true knowledge arises in the pure revelations of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

In like manner, the assertion that the Divinity of Christ, as the second person of the Trinity, is purely a New Testament doctrine, needs to be viewed in connection with what is affirmed concerning the knowledge of a personal Logos among the Jews, at the time of the advent of our Saviour. It has been maintained that the Jewish Scriptures convey the idea of the Logos, in the phrase, the Word of God, implying that this phrase is the designation of a Divine person, with omnipotent power, and that it is identical with the Logos of John. If we rest upon the Scripture alone, for the meaning of this epithet, we should undoubtedly come to the conclusion, with some of the most learned critics, that it is only a periphrasis for God, or used as expressive of his active power, or his wisdom. It can hardly be maintained that this term could have conveyed to the Jewish mind the conception of the Word, who was to become incarnate among men.

Aside from a purely Scriptural testimony, the chief reliance, in maintaining the view in question, is founded upon the writings of Philo. He was contemporary with Christ, and all accounts of him agree, that he infused into his Jewish notions many ideas derived from the Platonic philosophy, and that the Logos which he held was neither a purely Jewish, nor a purely Platonic idea. It has been characterized by Dr. Pye Smith "as merely conceptual, capable only of being manifested to the spiritual or intellec-

tual part of man." Philo asserts, "that the Divine Word would not assume a visible form or representation, and that it was not to be reckoned among the objects known by sense." But his views were discordant and confused. As a philosopher he reasoned, and speculated, and uttered his sentiments under forms which are Platonic in their type. At other times, speaking as a Jew, he seems to have admitted the personality and the visibility of the Logos. It is probable that his own opinions partook of a mixed character; and, while in some representations he harmonizes with the most abstract and spiritual views of the Logos, as a mere intellectual conception, in other representations he coincides more nearly with the ideas of Scripture. Authors who treat of the doctrines of Philo do not agree. He is, in fact, inconsistent with himself. There is a presumption, that his speculations were modified by opinions common among his Jewish contemporaries, and therefore his writings furnish some evidence that the doctrine of a Divine Logos engaged the thoughts of men at that period. But the facts in the case hardly justify the opinion that either Philo or the Jews immediately antecedent to his times, understood the Divine character of the Messiah. Upon comparing the clear and definite descriptions which the evangelists give of Christ, with these vague speculations, and gathering up the material for an exact idea of his person and character from his own sayings and acts, it seems impossible to merge one of these into the other. The Jewish Logos, and the Logos of Philo are not convertible. So that we cannot derive, from the facts in question, a convincing argument that the Divine Saviour, in his distinct personality, and his coequality with God, was known before the Messiah himself was manifested. And after Jesus himself appeared, a true knowledge of him was slowly developed. He illustrated his Divine attributes in his life, and the profound wisdom of his communications; and gradually his disciples and those who followed them, received the hitherto unacknowledged fact of Jesus Christ, as God manifest in the flesh, the Son of God equal with the Father.

In view, then, of what may be gathered concerning a Trinity of persons in the doctrines of the Platonists, and a Divine Logos in the writings of Philo, we are still left to the conclusion, that God, as subsisting under the conditions of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three coequal persons in one Godhead, belongs purely to the doctrines of revelation. While we discover, in regard to the

Platonic Trinity, some surprising similarity, and while Philo taught some things concerning a Divine Logos, like the characteristics exhibited of Christ in the Scriptures, yet the two systems are not at all convertible. The point where it is possible for either of these to be merged into the Scripture statements, is, to say the least, obscure. It would be difficult for any one to substitute the Highest Good, the Intellect, and the wisdom of Plato, for the Divine Being, who, in the threefold form of the Scriptures, carries on the work of human redemption. Still more difficult would it be to convert Philo's Logos into the crucified Redeemer of the Gospels. The notions of these systems do not compare with the true doctrine of the Divine Being, as the elementary notions of a Deity do with the true idea of the one God. In the latter case, the connection is readily discerned; in the former, it is not. So that, before we can really accept these refined philosophic theories, as a preëxisting knowledge of the peculiar doctrines of the New Testament in regard to the being of God, they must be greatly changed in their form, and more distinctly traced to a fundamental conception of the real mystery of the Godhead.

We may then pass from the character of Christ and that of the Holy Ghost, to their offices in the economy of redemption. The great design of the incarnation of the Son of God was, to complete the work of redemption. It was the Divine economy to expiate sin only by suffering, and to deliver mankind from punishment by means of a sacrifice worthy of the magnitude of the occasion. The connection between pardon and expiatory sacrifices was very early disclosed. It was involved and clearly illustrated in the Mosaic ritual. The Jew read it continually in the death of the victims slain at the altar, "that without the shedding of blood there was no remission." The idea must have been closely woven into the texture of his religious views, so that whatever hope he had of mercy, rested, in some way, upon an atoning sacrifice. And yet it was never taught him, nor intended that he should believe, that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sin. It was forcibly impressed that God had no pleasure in them, but that his delight was in a broken and contrite heart. In fact, the conditions of forgiveness under the old dispensation, so far as they relate to the feelings and character of the individual, are identical with those in the new. Sorrow was to be exercised for sin, the mind humble, the heart

contrite; evil ways were to be forsaken; God was to be loved and honored and submitted to. Even faith, which holds so prominent a position in the evangelical system, was an indispensable condition of salvation. It was not a specific faith in Jesus Christ, exercised as we are required to exercise it. Its object was primarily God. To trust in God was the imperative duty, and the richest blessings were offered in connection with its performance. Those who sought God's favor, were to approach him with penitent confessions, with prayer and offerings, with a new heart and with the purpose of an holy obedience. So that, subjectively, the way of salvation under the old dispensation, involved the same elementary feelings, and was expected to produce substantially the same devout and godly life, as is looked for under the Gospel. But the object of faith, and the specific manner of its exercise, were widely different. The real ground of pardon, and the method of God's mercy, were, to say the least, but very obscurely revealed. It could not, indeed, have escaped the spiritual Jew, that their sacrifices were only typical. We may freely believe, that they looked upon the altar and the lamb, as emblems and shadows of better things to come. It may be, that, throughout the whole system, there was a dim intimation to their minds, of another more princely victim, a royal sufferer; and that, through the gloom, faith strained its feeble eye to catch a glimpse of one, who was worthy to suffer the just for the unjust. Whether or not they sang with the understanding in their Psalms of the agony of the garden, or read in Isaiah of the true Lamb of Calvary, they evidently had this before them, that their forgiveness was assured by believing in the promises which God made. And these promises were presented to them in close dependence upon the blood of sacrifices, and these sacrifices were only a faint representation of the great sacrifice. The efficacy of the promise was in the provision of mercy in which we rejoice. The blood which cleanses us, really cleansed them. And though their faith was exercised in the midst of obscure revelations, and visions hardly palpable in the overshadowing cloud, while ours is demanded in the full brilliancy of the sun of righteousness, yet a true faith in them was as efficacious, and as sufficient for justification, as the faith of any believer in these better days. But the glory of the Lord had not risen upon them. A deliverer was promised. They looked forward to a Messiah who was to come. And yet we are forced to admit, that the way of salvation

which is the preëminent revelation of God to lost men, could not have been known to the early saints, in its explicit terms, its reasonable method, in its openness, its freeness, its unfailing security. Its only clear exposition is in the life and words, the sufferings and death of Christ. The Jew lived in hope. His probation was passed amid shadows and perishing emblems. A prospective glory lay before him, and his imagination was excited by the lofty enunciations of his inspired prophets. In various forms, sometimes of regal splendor and magnificence rising to an unearthly grandeur, and then of lowliness and suffering, a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief, did the pencil of the seer delineate to them their expected Messiah. The prophets, it may be, saw and comprehended clearly. But to other eyes the picture was confused, the light and the shade mysteriously blended, the characters obscure, and the precise meaning of the whole never apprehended. They hoped for things which they saw not. And hence, notwithstanding the abundant help which we get from the ritual service, and the prophetic declarations of the Old Testament, in determining the precise import and bearing of the doctrine of atonement, it must be evident that these had, before the actual appearance of Christ, less significance. So that, while the death of Christ is really the ground on which every believer is accepted of God, the early saints exercised their faith vaguely and blindly, without a specific object, and an intelligent comprehension of the method of God's redeeming love. Not so under the new dispensation. The fulness of time has come. What the prophets saw in bewildering vision, what the saints longed for with holy ecstasy, what the angels desired to see but were not permitted, is unveiled and present to our wondering eyes. That point in history, toward which all the prophetic rays converged, has been passed, and the full light now shines. The Son of God has appeared. He has unfolded the Father's love and the purposes of his mercy. He has opened to all men the way of pardon and explicitly announced the conditions and grounds of forgiveness. The death and sufferings of the Redeemer have furnished the key by which are unlocked those treasures of knowledge, which were hid in the obscure intimations and types of the early dispensation. The character and government of God appear under a new light. His justice is vindicated in Christ's sufferings. His mercy is impressively proclaimed in the sacrifice of his Son. The nature

and evil of sin are manifested in the divinely appointed remedy for it. The whole way of life is open and clear. The conditions of pardon are specific. The object of faith is definite. The knowledge of Christ, as the atoning Saviour, who hath shed his blood and hath promised eternal life to every penitent believer, removes from the way of salvation all darkness and uncertainty. How a sinner can be saved, is now as clear as the sun at noon-day. This is the peculiar glory of the Gospel. Not that there is any new mercy in God, not that the possibility of salvation is a new thing, but that a full, sufficient, intelligent disclosure is made of the grounds of acceptance, the way of coming to God, and the abundant and sure provisions for the redemption of the soul. So greatly do the light and knowledge thrown upon human duty and destiny, from the pages of the New Testament, transcend all previous communications, that we are constrained to feel that we have in it a new revelation, opening to a ruined and fallen race, the most full, elevating and satisfying hopes of glory and immortal life.

From what has already been said concerning the person of the Holy Ghost, it will be readily inferred that a knowledge of the specific place assigned him in the work of redemption, is confined to the New Testament. His coming to impart miraculous gifts, was a new manifestation. His coöperation with Christ in perfecting the salvation of believers could not have been previously known. He was promised by Christ, to be with his disciples after his own death, to enlighten, comfort and sanctify. The truth of his agency in convincing of sin, as well as his constant influence, as dwelling in the hearts of Christians, are parts of a new economy. Before the giving of the Spirit in these offices, God was the refuge and strength of his people. His own agency was the sanctifying power, and he sustained and comforted the faithful who put their trust in him. And, so far as these effects had been heretofore attributed to the Spirit of God, we apprehend that they did not, as we have before stated, indicate to the believer a separate personality in the Divine essence, but an influence which God exerted spiritually. If this is not so, it is difficult to understand the teachings of Christ, in regard to the Holy Ghost, and the ignorance which was manifested by the first disciples on this subject. They, without doubt, knew the Scriptures which spoke of the Spirit of God, but they had had no instruction in regard to that peculiar agency of the Holy

Ghost which began to be manifested after the resurrection. If the Holy Ghost was himself unknown, as distinguished from the Father, then it is a necessary consequence that his personal work should be unknown; and we are, therefore, authorized to consider, as peculiar to Christianity, all those delightful announcements for the comfort of Christians, which Christ made in his promises of the Spirit.

To some minds, these views concerning God and the economy of redemption, may perhaps be thought to invalidate those arguments for the Trinity, and the character and work of Christ, which are gathered from the Old Testament. It will, however, be observed, that what has been said, does not at all interfere with any reasonable inferences which may be made from the Hebrew Scriptures, from a Christian point of view. We gather important evidence from these Scriptures to confirm the true doctrine of the Divine essence, the character and work of Christ, the person and offices of the Spirit. Such testimony is appropriate and weighty; it is indispensable in filling out completely the Christian argument. And yet the same statements and facts, seen only in a Jewish light, may have been, and probably were, altogether incompetent to the establishment of the conclusions which we reach. As a prophecy finds its highest elucidation in the fulfilment, so the type is best expounded by the antitype. And thus, facts and doctrines of the Gospel, which were unknown to the ancient church, though seminally imbedded in their Scriptures, are detected there and brought out, by reason of the light thrown back upon the past by the fuller revelation now enjoyed, and are used as helps to confirm our knowledge and our faith. The Scriptures are but one system of truth, arranged according to a law which most successfully develops its varied relations and its exhaustless significance. The recorded experience of the church is an illustration of the power and application of truth, and, as history progresses, the development of truth will progress. So that we may not yet indulge the feeling that any part of Divine revelation has been searched to the bottom, or that any one doctrine of the Word has yet been exhibited in all the distinctness, in which it will bless the eyes and cheer the hearts of believers, in coming generations.

With such increase of knowledge of the character of God and the methods of the Divine government, with the full manifestation of a Divine Redeemer and a Sanctifier of God's people, it

must follow, as a necessary consequence, that the whole development of religion in the lives of disciples, would partake of a more definite form and exhibit greater strength and moral purity. And hence it is that, in the whole New Testament, there is a higher type of spiritual religion, a wider range of duty inculcated, and a more intelligent faith. Upon the knowledge of the way of life in the atonement made by Christ, is based the distinct and elevating hopes in which Christians rejoice. For, in the Gospel, the fact of immortality is established, the resurrection of the body is plainly announced, the final judgment disclosed to view, and the condition of the soul in eternity.

The state of human knowledge before the coming of Christ, on these points, has already been adverted to. The apprehensions of men in respect to them were undefined. The ideas entertained were involved in all the uncertainty and vagueness of conjecture. But in the teachings of Christ and the apostles, the fact of immortality is settled with the utmost precision. And it is not merely declared that the soul continues to exist when it leaves the body, in virtue of its spiritual essence, but that it shall live in the body which has passed under the dominion of death in virtue of its inherent corruptibility. The body itself is to live again, the soul to be reunited with it; and the body which has undergone the process of dissolution, is itself to be re-composed in an incorruptible and glorious form, identical with its previous self, so far, as that the soul and body united, shall again constitute the same person. And with so much exactness is this transformation declared as a contingent of an immortal existence, that those whose lives are continued up to the period of this general resurrection from the grave, will pass through a like process, without the usual dissolution, their bodies being changed at once into the glorious bodies which are to be the eternal habitation of the soul. The Christian revelation has surpassed all other knowledge in the disclosure of this great mystery. The human mind clings to the belief of a continued life; but, in respect to the body, the obvious conclusion of the understanding is, that it is irrecoverably lost. So entire is its decomposition, and so scattered are the elements which entered into it in its integrity, that it is to us inconceivable how it should be resuscitated, and again resume its physical unity. Even with the revelation, we are yet in great darkness, as to the particulars of the change, and as to the condition and precise constitution of the

glorified body. So profound is the mystery, that science does nothing at all to enlighten us. Its speculations serve only to make the mystery darker, and to raise doubts of a great fact, which can only be received upon Divine testimony. This doctrine, then, so far from having been included in human knowledge without a revelation, is now only known because it is so declared. We receive the fact. Our reasonings and our researches are as incompetent to explain it, as were the unaided minds of men to discover it. It is one of the great things in the methods of God, which is disclosed as far as our profit required, while the rest is still held in the profoundest concealment.

As consequent upon what is declared in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and its reunion with the glorified body, we have the knowledge of the general judgment, and the final separation of the righteous and wicked. The whole scene, in its distinct purpose, in the person of the judge, in the precision and solemnity of the process, in the absolute justice of the sentence, in the unchangeable fate assigned to each individual, is altogether new. The mythological representations of ancient superstition may be said to be the embodiment of the anticipations of the human mind concerning retribution. The reason and conscience claim such a reckoning as this life does not afford. The foreshadowings of a judgment have not otherwise found a reality. In the Christian Scriptures it is revealed. It stands as a sequel and completion of the work of Christ. Jesus Christ is the constituted judge of the whole human race; a man, by virtue of his incarnation; God, in virtue of his union with the Father. His union with man fits him to meet man, and to appreciate the trials and the infirmities of his condition, and to understand the force of his temptations, and to measure the quality and extent of his ability, which is the just criterion of blameworthiness. The interests of humanity are safe in his hands. As God, he is qualified in respect to absolute omniscience and infinite justice; so that the necessities of the Divine government shall be met, and all the purposes and requirements of the holy law of God applied to human conduct. So exact an adjustment is no human conception. The plan is Divine in its origin, and is discovered to us only in the revelation which God has made by his Son. It is the only satisfactory solution ever presented to the human mind, of the hitherto unresolved problem of retribution. In combining God's omniscience and infinite justice, in a nature which

sympathizes with the frailty and trials of offending man, the interest of the throne and the interests of the subject are equally defended. This is a purely Christian idea; and one which marks the advancement of the knowledge imparted in the New Testament, beyond all that is attainable from other sources.

We cannot claim that the idea of happiness, as consequent upon righteousness, or of suffering, as consequent upon sin, belongs distinctively even to the Bible. They seem to be the necessary growth of our moral constitution. It comes into the mind with a seeming unavoidableness, along with the consciousness of guilt, that a punishment awaits us. And all nations have been found erecting some form of prison-houses for the endurance of future torment. And so also has the mind pictured abodes of blessedness attainable by a life of virtue. And here we can only say in respect to the New Testament, that it opens to human view, with an absolute certainty, the punishment of the wicked, its fearful character and its eternal continuance, and with a power and distinctness which surpass all previous conceptions. It is authoritatively, and with fearful strength of description, announced, as the warning voice of God to those who are approaching retribution. And, in like manner, the character, the fulness, the purity, the security, and the permanence of the joys of heaven are propounded to us, insomuch that the Apostle says of these communications of the Spirit, that eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the joys which God hath in store for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit. And with such knowledge of the eternal world, the reunion of the soul and body, the final judgment of the Son of man, the retribution of eternal death to the wicked and of eternal life to the righteous, does the Christian faith leave all other systems and schemes far in the background. It contains, in these momentous disclosures, all that is needful for us to know for our own advancement in holiness and salvation, while it opens to us a field of elevating contemplation, and plies us with motives of the utmost cogency.

In concluding these remarks, it may not be improper to observe, that truth has been communicated to the human mind very much in the degree in which the mind has been adapted to receive it. There is a process of growth and development in the intellect of the race, as in that of the individual man. In has its infancy, its season of progress, and of maturity. The power of generaliz-

ing, of noting abstract relations, and conceiving spiritual ideas must have been very limited, in the early history of the world. Knowledge assumed a rougher and more material form. Rude passion and uncultivated feeling, of necessity, had a more unrestrained play. And it could not but have been, that the form in which moral truth was communicated, and the particular character of truth were modified so as to be adapted to the particular condition of the human mind. The great elementary principles of duty, both in respect to man and God, are found to have been imparted to the mind almost coeval with his existence. But they could not have been understood in all their necessary or possible applications. The ten commandments are an exceedingly abstract and comprehensive code, the real intent and meaning of which hardly dawned upon the world till after the time of Christ, though it had been known, in its formula, for two thousand years. The whole ante-Christian era was one of slow progress in correct principles, and in the rectification of notions and ideas which the mind seized in the gross, but which were not analyzed. There was a struggle going on between the material and the spiritual, between the forms of conduct and the reign of motives; and it was only by this process that the human race was brought up to a condition to receive a new and more spiritual revelation by Jesus Christ. If we admit that, in the older condition of the race, there were scattered among men the great elementary notions and principles of human duty, we are only yielding to a necessity, when we say they were not truly combined in human knowledge, and that they were not apprehended in their true intent and spirit. And, by the same necessity, we are compelled to look for higher forms of truth, and for a wider range of knowledge, under the new dispensation. The progress of the human mind makes it capable of rising to higher views of God, and of conceiving spiritual relations more truly. This is precisely what we find. The New Testament contains a revelation which adapts itself to this growth and development of the intellect of the race. It is a vast repository of objective truth, which the mind of man is to explore, and into which it will continually make new researches, and from which it will continually derive knowledge, to satisfy its constantly widening capacity. Truth, as it exists, does not alter. But the perception of truth is destined to become clearer and more impressive, and the relations of truth to human conduct, to be known with more exactness and

fulness. As the powers of the mind are more highly exercised, as the laws of mental operation are better understood, as science unfolds to us more of the mysteries of the material world, and as language becomes a more nice medium for the transmission of thought, the truths and doctrines of the word of God will shine in a new and distincter light. As under the long discipline of the Jewish theocracy, the conception of God was purged of the gross materialism and multiplicity in which it was involved, until the Divine unity stood out unimpaired, so, under the higher discipline of Christ and the Spirit in the kingdom of the Redeemer, will the truth be gradually purified of whatever crudeness and darkness still mixes itself with it, until the whole spiritual firmament shall shine with unobscured brightness, and every particular star in the radiant galaxy shall be marked and known by its own familiar light. Truth itself is eternal; the mind of man progressive; and not until the mind shall have reached the last stage of its development in time, will the whole mystery of the wisdom of God be fully known or understood.

ARTICLE VI.

THE SIMILARITY BETWEEN THE EPISTLE OF JUDE AND THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.

By Rev. Frederic Gardiner, Bath, Maine.

MANY and various are the conjectures which, from time to time, have been put forth to account for the remarkable resemblance between the epistle of Jude and the second of Peter. One critic finds, in the fact of this resemblance, conclusive proof that neither Apostle could have seen the epistle of the other, or he would not have written his own; another thinks it equally clear that one of them must have had the epistle of the other before his eyes. This one cannot doubt that the epistle of Jude, being more terse and having greater concinnity, bears the plain mark of originality, and must have been the earlier of the two; but another is convinced that the epistle of

Peter preceded that of Jude, by a period long enough to allow of his warning to have been forgotten and his prophecies fulfilled. It has been suggested, on the one hand, that Jude might have been in the habit of hearing Peter preach, and so have set down briefly, from memory, what Peter spoke, and afterwards himself wrote more fully; and, on the other hand, it has been imagined that both writers might have derived their ideas and their language from some other common source, of which we know nothing. And if there be any other possible theory, it has not wanted an advocate among the host of those who have sought to solve this interesting but most difficult question.

Amid this Babel of opinions among men of learning and sagacity, it may be doubted whether there really exist sufficient data for the establishment of any one view. Yet, in this doubt, the student of Scripture cannot willingly acquiesce, until such data as there are, have been fully presented to view, and all inferences drawn from them which they will legitimately bear. Arnold has justly remarked in regard to uncertainty in matters of history: "Scepticism must ever be a misfortune or a defect: a misfortune, if there be no means of arriving at truth; a defect, if, while there exist such means, we are unable or unwilling to use them."¹ The uncertainty in regard to the present question must be considered more as a defect than a misfortune, until a clear examination, and a more careful weighing of the evidence is made, than has hitherto been done, at least in our own language. This defect, LAURMAN, in his admirable work upon this epistle,² proposed to remedy; but he abruptly left his task half-finished.³ There seems, therefore, the more necessity, that some one else should take up the work and carry it on to such conclusion as he may.

There is no reliable historical evidence bearing upon the subject, and the investigation must be conducted wholly on other grounds. To this end, the first thing is to place the epistles

¹ Arnold, *History of Rome*, Introduction, pp. 13, 14.

² *Collectanea, sive notae criticae et commentarius in epistolam Judae. Accedunt de fonte doctrinae, et dictionis Judae genere et colore, disputationes duae. Auctore M. T. Laurman. Groningae. 1818.*

³ "Priorem tantum Disputationis partem dare malui, quam binas reliquas addere, nondum ea quae par erat diligentia elaboratas; memor etiam moniti cl. Praeceptoris Wassenberghii, 'Mirificem quandam convenientiam esse inter hanc Judae epistolam et caput illud secundum alterius Petri; in ejus rei causas inquirere licere, reddere tamen illas difficulter posse.'" P. 233 not. in loc. de fonte doct. (31).

themselves fairly before the eye of the reader, arranged in parallel columns, a few transpositions being made in Jude, and portions of second Peter omitted for the sake of brevity.

2 PETER.

1: 2. Grace and peace be multiplied unto you, etc.

* * * * *

12. Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things, though ye know them, and be established in the present truth.

13. Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up, by putting you in remembrance:

14. Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me.

15. Moreover, I will endeavor that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance.

16. For we have not followed cunningly-devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty.

17. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

18. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount.

19. We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts;

20. Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.

21. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

JUDE.

1. Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called:

2. Mercy unto you, and peace, and love, be multiplied.

3. Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you, that ye should earnestly contend for the faith

which was once delivered unto the saints.

2 PETER.

2: 1. But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.

2. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.

3. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.

4. For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment;

5. And spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly;

6. And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly.

* * * * *

10. But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government. Presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities:

11. Whereas angels, which are greater in power and might, bring not railing accusation against them before the Lord.

12. But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption;

JUDE.

4. For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

5. I will therefore put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this, how that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterwards destroyed them that believed not.

6. And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day.

7. Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.

8. Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities.

9. Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil (he disputed about the body of Moses), durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee.

10. But these speak evil of those things which they know not: but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves.

2 PETER.

JUDE.

13. And shall receive the reward of unrighteousness, as they that count it pleasure to riot in the day-time. Spots they are and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you :

14. Having eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin ; beguiling unstable souls : a heart they have exercised with covetous practices ; cursed children :

15. Which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness,

16. But was rebuked for his iniquity ; the dumb ass, speaking with man's voice, forbade the madness of the prophet.

17. These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest,

to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever.

18. For when they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lust of the flesh, through much wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error.

* * * * *

3: 1. This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you ; in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance ;

2. That ye may be mindful of the words which were before spoken by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour ;

3. Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts.

* * * * *

7. But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against

12. These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you,

feeding themselves without fear :

11. Woe unto them ! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core.

Clouds they are without water, carried about of winds ; trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots ;

13. Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame ; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.

16. These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts ; and their mouth speaketh great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration because of advantage.

17. But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ ;

18. How that they told you there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts.

19. These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit.

2 PETER.

the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.

8. But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.

9. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.

10. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up.

* * * * *

14. Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless:

15. And account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation;

* * * * *

17. Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness:

18. But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory both now and for ever. Amen.

JUDE.

14. And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints,

15. To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.

20. But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost,

21. Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life.

22. And of some have compassion, making a difference:

23. And others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh.

24. Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy,

25. To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen.

It is impossible to suppose that such a resemblance, as is here presented to us, could have been accidental. The similarity consists, not merely in general design and argument, but extends to the order and arrangement of the two epistles; to the use of particular illustrations and comparisons, and even of the same words and phrases, and those sometimes of an unusual character. Such resemblance can hardly be accounted for by suppos-

ing that one of the writers had been in the habit of listening to the preaching of the other. The idea that both drew from some common, but now unknown, source, is destitute of any shadow of evidence; and, while it must be pressed to the utmost limit to account for the verbal coincidences of the epistles, could, in the end, only have the effect of doubling the present difficulty.

It may, therefore, be assumed, as the basis of the present inquiry, that one of the writers must in some way have been made acquainted, not only with the ideas, but with the language used by the other. It is believed that reasons abundantly sufficient to justify this assumption will appear in the course of the investigation.

It may not be amiss to remind the reader, at the outset, that among the writers of Scripture, quotations and imitations of one another without express acknowledgment, stand upon a very different footing from that occupied by the same act among uninspired authors. With the former, there could be no design of concealment, inasmuch as all earlier portions of Scripture were already familiar to those for whom they wrote. From the nature of their office, they could lay no claim to originality of idea; and, if only the truth were declared in the most effectual way, it mattered little whether the language were new or old. The Spirit of truth seems either to have required that the same things should be set forth, in the same way, at different times, and by different persons; or else, merely directing the same things to be taught, the inspired writer naturally found expression for them in language already familiar. No student of Scripture can need to be reminded how often, especially in the visions of prophecy, the same or very similar passages may be found in different books. Micah 4: 1—3 compared with Isaiah 2: 2—4; the former part of Obadiah with Jeremiah xlix. (especially Obad. 1—4 with Jer. 49: 14—16; Obad. 5, 6 with Jer. 49: 9, 10; Obad. 8, 9 with Jer. 49: 7, 8), and the striking resemblances between parts of the Apocalypse and the writings of the ancient prophets, particularly Daniel, may be mentioned as a few among the many instances of this fact. Therefore, without insisting upon the reference of both Peter (3: 2) and Jude (17, 18) to the words of others, the above considerations, if duly weighed, are sufficient to exempt the later writer from the suspicion of that moral obliquity which is now involved in the charge of plagiarism.

The resemblance between the epistles, although most strongly marked in the second chapter of Peter, is not altogether wanting in the first, and is very noticeable in some parts of the third chapter. It becomes more remarkable throughout when the language is carefully examined in the original.

Much weight of learned authority may be found on either side of the question: "Which of the epistles was first written?" Jessien (de *avθerria* ep. Judae, c. iv. p. 83) alleges in favor of the priority of Peter: "Millius, Wolfius, Semlerus, Chr. F. Schmidius, Zachariae certe quoad partem, Michaelis, Storrius, Hanleinius, Stolgius, Pottius, Flattius, Dahlus, Planchius junior in praelectionibus." In favor of the priority of Jude: "Hederus, Gablerus, Vogel, Schmidtius, Hugius, Welckerus, Richtorus, Eichornius," add Jessien. The list might easily be extended on either side of the question. In this division of authorities, the only reliance for a determination of the question is in a careful balancing of the arguments to be derived from an examination of the epistles themselves.

1. The *prima facie* evidence is unquestionably in favor of the priority of Jude. There is a certain terseness about it, a nervous brevity of expression, which ill accords with the idea of its being borrowed. It abounds in freshness and vigor both of thought and language, and shows in its composition the intense order of a powerful mind. It is, moreover, far more remarkable than the epistle of Peter for its close coherence throughout, its *concinnity*, a point of no small importance in the determination of this question.

2. The second epistle of Peter was addressed primarily to the same persons as the first (2 Peter 3: 1); that is, "to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythinia" (1 Peter 1: 1). If the epistle of Jude was intended primarily for some single church or class of persons, we know nothing positively of any such design. It bears no mark of any particular address, and, perhaps, was from the first designed for the church at large. Which supposition is the more probable — that Jude, knowing of Peter's epistle to the churches of Asia Minor, in which there was nothing peculiar to those churches but which did contain several passages claiming especial authority for the writer, should have thought it advisable to abridge it for the benefit of the church at large; or that Peter, having read the catholic epistle of Jude, should

have thought fit to commend its substance, extended and enforced by his own especial authority, to churches to whom he was well known, and to whom he had written before? The balance of probabilities, to our mind, is decidedly in favor of the latter hypothesis.

3. There is not here room for the discussion of the question whether Jude be the same with the *Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου* of Luke 6: 16 and Acts 1: 13, one of the twelve disciples. On the supposition, however, that he was not—and this supposition accords well with his own silence upon the point—the argument above given acquires fresh force. And, even if he were one of the twelve, he was certainly less known, and his authority less widely revered than that of Peter. If Jude wrote first, it is easy to see that Peter's repetition might have the object of adding weight to the instructions of the former; but if Peter's epistle were the earlier, it does not appear with precisely what object Jude should have afterwards written the same things.

4. In their general object and design, these two epistles are absolutely identical. In view of the corrupting influence of evil men surreptitiously entered into the church, they seek to encourage in the faithful a firm adherence to the doctrine and practice of the true faith.

The only apparent dissimilarity in this respect is, that, while Jude speaks of a present and pressing danger, the words of Peter seem to have respect to the future. This difference has sometimes been much insisted upon; but it loses its importance when it is considered that, as the same corruption might now be described in both the past and the present tense, so it might then have been spoken of, at the same time, in terms both of the present and the future. This might suffice to say here; but it does not fully present the facts. The language of Peter, fairly interpreted and one part compared with another, is in truth by no means exclusively future.¹ He does, indeed, speak in some places of a time which had not then arrived. This is shown, not merely by the use of the future tense in 2: 1—3 (where the future is evidently put in contrast with the past *ἔγερτο*, and might be fairly interpreted of the times of the

¹ Compare A. Jessien de *aiderric* epist. Judae. Leipsiae. 1821. cap. iv. pp. 90—92. This is a treatise, of little reverence enough, but valuable in this discussion.

Christian dispensation in opposition to those of the law); but by other passages, in which express mention is made of a period subsequent to the death of the writer (1: 12—15), described as "the last days" (3: 3), and of which the readers of the epistle were thereby forewarned (3: 17). On the other hand, however, in other passages the false teachers are described with equal clearness as already come, and busy in corrupting the church. Throughout the portion of the epistle extending from the tenth to the seventeenth verses of the second chapter, and in which the resemblance to the epistle of Jude is most strongly marked, the language plainly refers to a state of things already existing. The same may be said of all the following verses of this chapter and of the sixteenth verse of the third. Whatever differences, therefore, there may be between the two epistles, in this respect, is also found between the different parts of that of Peter itself. Hence, the argument often based upon this difference in favor of the priority of Peter's epistle, is altogether without foundation; and, if any inference at all is to be drawn from the fact, that Peter speaks both of the present and the future, while Jude confines himself to the present, it must be in accordance with the general probability of the later date of the more extended composition.

5. Both writers have adopted the same plan of argument. Little difference would appear in the logical analysis of their epistles. Both speak of a fixed, unalterable standard of truth, to which the faithful ought carefully to cling; both describe the corrupters of the church in the same way, and in much the same words; both show the certainty of their punishment by appealing to a variety of examples in the history of the past, and to the warnings of prophecy looking forward to the far-distant future; both, in nervous language, describe their ungodliness in a series of comparisons; and both, having given counsel to the faithful, under the trying circumstances of the times, conclude with a doxology.

Some differences in the development of this plan were, of course, to be expected in epistles differing so much in length. Thus, the long and beautiful introduction in Peter (1: 3—11), is wanting in Jude; yet this is, in fact, only the development of the idea contained in both salutations (v. 2). Some differences arise from the personal circumstances of the writer, as when Peter (1: 17, etc.) appeals to his own presence at the

transfiguration in proof of what he says; and, if it be admitted that Jude was not of the number of the original apostles, Peter's claim and Jude's omission of all claim to apostleship is explained in the same way. Other differences, however, remain. The express quotation of ancient prophecy in Jude (14, 15) becomes a bare allusion thereto in Peter (3: 2); and the deviations of the former, in regard to the different courses to be pursued toward different classes of those tainted with corruption (22, 23), find no place at all in the epistle of the latter. On the other hand, it is a part of Peter's plan alone to speak of the deliverance of the righteous in the midst of the overthrow of the ungodly; and it is only in his epistle that we find mention made of the peculiar guilt of apostasy (2: 19—22). On the whole, these differences can be more easily accounted for by assuming the priority of Jude than of second Peter. On this assumption, indeed, there seems to be no especial reason why Peter should have omitted the counsels given by Jude in verses 22 and 23; but, with this single exception, the other points of difference all accord well with the supposition of the priority of the epistle of Jude.

The allusion to ancient prophecy (2 Peter 3: 2), and then the passing of it by, in the glow of the following description of the world's destruction, is natural, and easy to be accounted for, if the epistle of Peter were the later written; but the omission of all that glowing description, and the introduction in its place of the prophecy of Enoch, are not so easily to be explained, if Jude wrote afterwards. So, also, Peter's directing attention to the deliverance of the righteous in the midst of the overthrow of the ungodly, is a matter which might easily be introduced by one who had the epistle of Jude before him, but would not have been so likely to be omitted by one making use of the epistle of Peter. The same may be said of the mention of the peculiar guilt of apostasy (2 Peter 2: 19—22); it is much easier to account for its introduction than for its omission.

It should be constantly borne in mind that what we here seek is not demonstrative truth, of which the case does not admit; but the balance of probabilities. However slight may be the preponderance of probability in favor of the priority of one epistle or the other, in each particular of the comparison, yet, if that preponderance be uniformly, or almost uniformly, on one side, it must, in the aggregate, be sufficient to turn the scale.

6. As matters of more minute detail come under review, there is the better basis for desired inferences. In the following table, the eye can at once detect both the similarity and the dissimilarity of the particular illustrations, comparisons, and prophecies of the two epistles.

PETER.	JUDE.
2: 1. False prophets of old.	5. The destruction of the unbelievers, although previously delivered from Egypt.
4. The reservation of the angels that sinned in durance unto judgment.	6. The reservation of the angels that sinned in durance unto judgment.
5. The flood and the deliverance of Noah.	
6. The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah,	7. The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them.
7. The deliverance of Lot,	
11. The moderation of angels.	9. The moderation of the archangel.
12. The comparison to beasts. ¹	10. The comparison to beasts. ¹
13. The disturbance of the "feasts of charity."	12. The disturbance of the "feasts of charity."
Spots (<i>σπίλοι</i> = rocks ?)	Sunken rocks (<i>σπίλιδες</i>).
15, 16. The example of Balaam.	11. The example of Cain. The example of Balaam. The example of Korah.
17. Wells without water, Clouds carried with a tempest. }	{ 12. Clouds without water, carried about of winds, Trees without fruit, etc. Raging waves, etc. Wandering stars.
To whom <i>ὁ ἔλεος τοῦ ἀγίου</i> is reserved for ever.	To whom <i>ὁ ἔλεος τοῦ ἀγίου</i> is reserved for ever.
3: 2. The words before spoken by the holy prophets,	14, 15. Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, etc.
2, 3. The prophecy of us, the Apostles,	17, 18. The prophecy of the Apostles,
5, 6. The flood,	

The first difference to be here noted, is the mention of "false prophets among the people" (sc. of Israel) by Peter (2: 1), to which there is nothing corresponding in Jude. This is a matter of so little importance, that its introduction or omission would be of little consequence either way, were it not for the connection in which it stands. The last six verses of 2 Peter 1:

¹ The comparison is the same, but used for different purposes; in Jude, to mark the knowledge derived from natural instincts, in Peter more obscurely, to express the ignorant brutality of insubordination.

(16—21) correspond to the last clause of Jude 3. At the end of so great an amplification (supposing Peter to have had the epistle of Jude before him), the writer found himself speaking of the holy prophets of old; how could he pass over thence to the evil men in the Christian church, spoken of in Jude 4? The transition is skilfully made — “but there were false prophets among the people, as also there shall be false teachers among you.” Yet, does not the allusion to the “false prophets” of old bear the appearance of having been introduced for the sake of the transition? And does not such and so abrupt a transition itself suggest the presumption, that the writer had the epistle of Jude before him, and wished to return to its course of thought?

In the parallel passages occupying the 5th, 6th and 7th verses of Jude, and the 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th of 2 Peter ii., are found three examples, two of which are common to both, while each supplies one additional example. There is also the further difference, that to the example of Sodom and Gomorrah is added in 2 Peter 2: 7, 8, the deliverance of Lot—in pursuance of his design, peculiar to himself, of showing the safety of the righteous amidst the overthrow of the ungodly. The example added by Peter, but omitted by Jude, is the overthrow of the world by the flood and the deliverance of Noah; the one found in Jude, but not mentioned in Peter, is the destruction of the unbelieving Israelites after they had been delivered from Egypt. With the assumed priority, with which of the epistles will this difference best accord? We do not know that any strong inference can be drawn from it in favor of the priority of either of the epistles; yet such force as the inference has, it lies in the same direction with those that have gone before. If second Peter had been already written, there seems no reason why Jude should have omitted the pertinent and striking example, ready to his hands, and twice cited in the epistle before him (2: 5 and 3: 5); nor is there any apparent reason, beyond the excellence of the example itself, for his introducing the destruction of the Israelites in the wilderness, and especially for his making it the first of his illustrations, thereby disturbing the chronological order strictly observed by Peter. On the other hand, if Peter had the epistle of Jude before him, it is easy to see why he should have omitted the mention of the destruction of the Israelites, partly, because it did not afford, without extension, any proof of

the deliverance of the righteous, and was, therefore, not so pertinent to his purpose as the mention of the flood and Noah; and, partly, because its place, according to his chronological arrangement, would have been at the close of the eighth verse, where the sense was in danger of being obscured by the long and artificial period, and where this example was easily passed by in the glow of composition. It is more natural, also, to suppose that the several examples should have been reduced to chronological order by the later writer, than that this order should have been disturbed by him when found in his exemplar. It may be remarked, that the flood, besides being a peculiarly pertinent example to this passage of Peter, seems to have been a favorite illustration with him. We find it again in the following chapter (3: 5, 6), and also in his former epistle (3: 20).

In the illustration drawn from the conduct of angels (Jude 9, 2 Peter 2: 11), there is this difference: Jude cites a particular instance; Peter makes a general declaration. It can hardly be doubted that both had the same facts in mind. If any inference can be drawn from the analogy of the inductive sciences, we must believe the record of the particular fact to be prior to the enunciation of the general principle based thereon. There was, indeed, in this case no discovery of either fact or principle; yet the fact is more likely to have suggested the principle, than the principle the fact.

In Jude 10 and 2 Peter 2: 12, there is the same comparison to *ἀλογα ζῶα*, but for different purposes. In the former, as already remarked in a note, it is used to indicate the knowledge derived from natural instincts. The comparison is apt, the illustration clear, and the whole verse graceful. In the parallel passage of Peter there is much obscurity. The object of the comparison seems to be, to set forth the ignorant brutality of insubordination. The addition of the words "made to be taken and destroyed," although in harmony with the general design of the epistle, yet makes this particular comparison still more involved. The language of Jude has the running clearness of the fountain; that of Peter, the fulness and also the comparative turbidness of the lake fed by it. This passage will come again under review.

Jude has given very briefly three examples (11), where Peter (2: 15, 16) has only one, but that one much more fully developed. The additional examples of Jude are not those

of an epitomist, but are new matter thought out by the author himself. On the supposition that Jude was the later writer, it is hard to account for his having preserved no trace of all that Peter has said concerning Balaam. On the other hand, if Peter had the epistle of Jude before him, it is easy to see why, having just spoken (v. 14) of "covetous practices," he should have seized upon the example of Balaam, and have dilated upon it, to the exclusion of the others.

That Jude should have retained no trace of the whole 14th verse of Peter, is only to be accounted for on the supposition that it had never been seen by him.

The word *σπίλοι*, with the addition *καὶ μῶμοι*, in 2 Peter 2: 13, seems not so much required by the context, as suggested by the word of similar sound, but of different import, *σπιδάδες*, in Jude 12. The comparison, by the latter, of the evil men who had crept unobserved into the *ἀγάπη* of the faithful, to sunken rocks at sea (for such, unquestionably, is the true sense of *σπιδάδες*), is pertinent and beautiful. The description of the same persons under the same circumstances by Peter, as "spots and blemishes," does not appear so natural, nor is the figure a clear one, unless we suppose that his *σπίλοι* was suggested by the *σπιδάδες* in Jude. The word *ἀπάταις* has also the appearance of having been suggested by the *ἀγάπαις* of Jude.

The remainder of the 12th and the 13th verses of Jude are occupied with a series of comparisons of which little appears in Peter. Suffice it here to say, that, while a later writer can easily be supposed to have selected an illustration or two from a number before him, it is hardly supposable that he should have introduced all the richness of illustration we find in Jude. A writer, having the epistle of Peter before him, and wishing to amplify this passage, would naturally have done so, by expanding the comparisons before him, and not by introducing wholly new matter. Moreover, the last clause, which is word for word the same in both epistles, although pertinent enough to its connection in 2 Peter 2: 17, is yet introduced with far greater force and beauty in Jude 12. Everlasting imprisonment in infernal darkness is a far more fitting termination to the career of "wandering stars," than to that of "clouds borne with a tempest." But, however this may be, the whole of this striking passage in Jude bears indubitable marks of originality. It evidently comes fresh from a mind highly wrought up with the subject. Instead

of the calmness of ordinary forms of expression, there is in it that glow and fervor, that heaping of figure upon figure, each rising above the other in intensity of meaning, which marks the creative power of the poet.

On a comparison of Jude 14, 15, 17 and 18 with 2 Peter 3: 2, 3, it appears that mention is made in both of ancient as well as of apostolic prophecy; but the former is only mentioned by Peter, while by Jude an express quotation is made of the remarkable prophecy of Enoch. We leave all inference from these facts to be made by more competent critics. For ourselves, we are not able to discover the bearing they may have upon the question of the relative priority of the epistles.

7. The general arrangement of the matter in both the epistles is precisely the same. In the details, also, the same order is, for the most part, observed, with only a few trifling variations, too slight to be of consequence in the present inquiry. Such a coincidence, in the arrangement of previously coincident thoughts and illustrations, is altogether beyond the range of accident, and gives warrant for the assumption, that one of the writers had the epistle of the other before his eyes, or at least strongly imprinted on his memory. Nevertheless, it may be said, in general, that the epistle of Jude has the compactness, the clearness of arrangement, and the close coherence of the various parts, which indicate an original; while, in the second epistle of Peter, the proportion of the parts is changed, and in several instances their connection more or less obscured, as if the writer had enlarged particular illustrations in an earlier document.

8. In comparing particular words and expressions in the two epistles, it will again be convenient to use a tabular form, setting down the more remarkable expressions of each in the original.

2 PETER.	JUDE.
1: 2. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθύν. θείη. ¹	2. ἔλεος ἡμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθύν. ¹
5. σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρενεργήσαντες. ²	3. πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος κοιτῆς σωτηρίας
1. τοῖς ἰσότημον ² ὑμῖν λαχοῦσι πίστει. 16—21.	τῇ ὑπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγ. πίστει.
2: 1. παρεκδξουσιν ² ψευδοδιδασκαλοῖς ²	4. παρεξείδυσαν ² τινὲς ἀνθρώποι

¹ An unusual word in relation to spiritual things (yet see Matt. 24: 12). In apostolic salutations occurring only in the epistle of Jude and the two of Peter.

² These words are ἀπ. λεγ.

2 PETER.	JUDE.
ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώ- λειαν.	{ οι πάσαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κῆμα
3. οἷς τὸ κῆμα ἔκπαιται ¹ οὐκ ἀργεῖ ¹ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν νυστάζει.	
2. αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις δι' οὗς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθή- σεται.	χάριν μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσελγίαν
1. τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτ. δεσπότην ἀρ- νούμενοι.	τὸν μόνον δεσπότην κ. Κ. ἡμ. Ι. Χ. ἀρνούμενοι.
4. ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων	{ 6. ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπ. τὸ ἴδιον οἶκ. εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας . . . τετή- ρηκεν. ² δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζῆφον.
παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους ² (Conf. ἡμέραν κρίσεως ver. 9.) σειραῖς ζῶφον.	6 and 13. ζῶφος. ³
4 and 17. ζῶφος. ³	
4. ταρταρώσας. ¹	
10. τοὺς ὅπισθι σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μισμοῦ πορευομένους.	7. ἐκπορεύεσθαι, ¹ καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας δείγμα. ¹
6. ὑπόδειγμα.	8. κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσι δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν.
10. κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας δόξας οὐ τρέμονσι βλασφημοῦντες.	9. οὐκ ἐτόλμησε κρίσιν ¹ ἐπενεγκ. βλασ- φημίας.
11. οὐ φέρονσι κατ' αὐτ. π. Κ. βλάσ- φημον κρίσιν. ⁴	10, 12, 16, 19, repetition of οἱ τοι.
12, 17, repetition of οἱ τοι.	10. ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδασι βλασφημοῦσιν φυσικῶς, ¹ ὥς τὰ ἄλογα ⁵ ζῶα, ἐν τοῖσι φθείρονται.
12. ἐν οἷς ἀνθρώποις βλασφημοῦντες ὥς ἄλογα ⁵ ζῶα, φυσικά, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καταφθαρήσονται.	11. ἐπορεύθησαν. ⁶
10. πορευομένους ⁵ (of the manner of life).	
13. ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις σπίλοι καὶ μοῖμοι ² συννευχοῦμενοι ⁷	12. ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις σπιλάδες ¹ συννευχοῦμενοι

¹ These words are ἀπ. λεγ.

² Very observable is this signification of τηρεῖν — carcere asservare.

³ This Homeric word, so peculiarly appropriate to the darkness of the infernal regions, in the New Testament occurs only in these two epistles, and is not found in the LXX.

⁴ κρίσις does not elsewhere in the New Testament occur in this sense, and but rarely in the LXX., although the signification is established by classical usage.

⁵ This peculiarly expressive word occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Acts 25: 27.

⁶ πορεύεσθαι is frequently used in this sense in the LXX. = ἔλθῃ (e. g. Lev. 26: 3, 23, 27, 40; 2 Chron. 6: 16, bis; Ps. 26: [25:] 1, etc.) and occasionally in the New Testament (see Luke 1: 6); but very seldom, if indeed ever, in the classics.

⁷ Occurring only in these places in the New Testament, and not found in the LXX.

2 PETER.

17. πηγαὶ ἄνδρῶν, ὁμίλῃαι [νεφέλαι]
ὑπὸ
λαίλαπτος ἑλαινόμεναι.
οἷς ὁ ζῶφος τοῦ σκότ. εἰς αἰῶνα
τετήρηται.
6. ἀσεβεῖν.¹
10. ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μiasμοῦ πορευομέ-
νους²
18. ὑπὲρογκατὰρ καταδύτης φθεγγ.
3: 2. μνησθῆναι τ. προειρημένον ῥη-
μάτων ὑπὸ τ. ἀγ. προφ., καὶ τ.
τ. ἀποστ. ἡμ. ἐντολῆς τοῦ Κυ-
ρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος.
3. ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν
ἐμπαίκεται⁴
κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτ. πο-
ρευ.²
14. σπουδάσατε ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμείμωτοι
αὐτῷ εὐχρηθῆναι ἐν εἰρήνῃ and v.
17.

JUDE.

- νεφέλαι ἄνδρῶν ὑπὸ
ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι.
13. οἷς ὁ ζῶφος τοῦ σκότ. εἰς αἰῶνα
τετήρηται.
15. ἥσειβησαν.¹
16. κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτ. πορευό-
μενοι²
καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτ. θαλεῖ ὑπὲρογκα.³
17. μνησθῆτε τ. ρημάτων τ. προει-
ρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ
Κυρίου.
18. ἐν ἐσχάτῃ χρόνῳ ἔσονται
ἐμπαίκεται⁴
κατὰ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πο-
ρευομ.²
24. φυλάξαι ἑμᾶς ἀπαιστον, καὶ
στῆσαι κατεν. τ. δόξης αὐτ. ἀμεί-
μους ἐν ἀγαλ.

These resemblances, it will be observed, consist, for the most part, in the use of the same, or nearly the same, words, to express the same thing; in a few instances, the similarity is in sense only; and in several, words are used alike in sound, but differing more or less widely in meaning; as *παρεϊσάξουσιν* and *παρεϊσέθουσιν*, *ἀπάταις* and *ἀγάπαις*, *σπίλοι* and *σπιλαδες*, *πηγαὶ ἄνδρῶν* and *νεφέλαι ἄνδρῶν*. To bring out the full force of the verbal similarity between the epistles, it must be remembered that the *style* of the two is widely different. The resemblance is not such as would arise from one writer's having been accustomed to hear the discourse of another until he gradually fell into the same way of thinking and speaking himself; but, on the contrary, each preserves throughout his own characteristic manner, while a large number of words and phrases, in several instances, of quite an unusual character, are common to them both. Such similarity,

¹ The verb is found only in these places. The noun *ἀσεβής* occurs three times in Jude, three times in Peter (one of them 1 Peter 4: 18) and thrice only elsewhere (Rom. 4: 5; 5: 6; 1 Tim. 1: 9).

² See note 6 above.

³ Found only in these places in the New Testament, and somewhat rare in the LXX.

⁴ Found only in these places in the New Testament. In the LXX occurs Isa. 3: 4, and (in var. lec.) 66: 4.

taken in connection with the other points of resemblance pointed out above, could not have been the result of accident.

Comparisons have been instituted between the language of Jude and several other books of Scripture, but with too little result to be here detailed. The following table, however, of words used by Jude, and not found more than once elsewhere, may be acceptable.

	JUDE.	2 PETER.	OTHER BOOKS.
αἰδώς	6.		Rom. 1: 20.
ἀσεβέω	15.	2: 6.	
ἀρχαγγέλος	9.		1 Thess. 4: 16.
ἐμπαικτης	18.	2: 3.	
ἐνυπνιαζόμενος	8.		Acts 2: 17.
ζόφος	6, 18.	2: 4, 17.	
οἰκητήριον	6.		2 Cor. 5: 2.
σπῆλλω	3.		James 3: 6.
συνευωχουμαι	12.	2: 3.	
ὑπέρογκος	16.	2: 18.	
ᾠφέλεια	16.		Rom. 3: 1.
To these should be added in the peculiar sense it here bears,			
κρίσις	9.	2: 2.	

From this it appears that of these twelve words there are as many common to Jude with second Peter only, as to Jude with all the rest of the New Testament together. There still remain in Jude fifteen words, and in second Peter fifty-four, not found at all elsewhere.

The consideration of the more minute resemblances between the two writers, has a most important bearing upon the question of the relative priority of the epistles. One can hardly select, at random, any half dozen of the expressions used by one writer, and modified by the other, without feeling that Jude, if we may so speak, furnished the raw material, Peter the finished product. To write in detail of every instance, would be a long and unnecessary labor; the more striking and important passages may well serve for examples of the whole.

Jude 3, as compared with 2 Peter 1: 5, shows, as Jessien has remarked, far more elegance in the latter, both in the arrangement of the words, and in the choice of the participle.

For the simple *κοιτῆς σωτηρίας* in the same verse of Jude, we have the same idea in the longer expression of 2 Peter 1: 1; and for *τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἀγίοις πίστει*, the whole six verses at

the close of 2 Peter i. It would have been difficult, indeed, thus to abridge Peter's language; it is far more easy to suppose that he has thus beautifully developed and enforced the idea suggested by Jude.

The words *οἱ πάλαι προεγ. εἰς τ. τ. κῆμα* in Jude 4, are much amplified in 2 Peter 2: 1 and 3. First, is the strong expression in verse 1, *ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτ. ταχ. ἀπώλειαν*; then verse 3, the words *οἷς τὸ κῆμα ἐκπαλαὶ οὐκ ἀργεῖ*, corresponding in sense with the language of Jude, but altered in form, as if for the express purpose of removing any possible ambiguity in their meaning; then, without the introduction of any new thought, apparently for the sake simply of fulness and emphasis, the expression is further amplified by the words *καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτ. οὐ νυστάζει*. These changes look like amplification on the part of Peter rather than abridgment on that of Jude.

The expression in the same verse, *χάριν μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν*, is replaced in 2 Peter 2: 2, by something to the same purpose, but much more full. In this change may be observed, not only the substitution of the requisite *ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας* in place of the more common *τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριν*, a change which would hardly have been made the other way, but also the popularity of the false teachers (*πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτ. τ. ἀσέλ.*), and, if we may so speak, the commentary upon *μετατιθέντες*. As the expression stands in Jude, its meaning is ambiguous, and may be explained either of the act of perverting the gracious doctrines of the Gospel, or of the effect of that act in making the Gospel, in the opinion of many, a system of licentiousness. Peter has chosen and clearly expressed the latter sense.

Still, in the same verse, we have a singular instance of a longer expression (*τὸν μόνον δεσπότην κ. τ. λ.*) in Jude, replaced by one more brief in Peter. Nevertheless, even this passage argues against the priority of second Peter; for it is hardly supposable that Jude, having it before him, should purposely have omitted the volume of argument bound up in the word *ἀγοράσαντα*.

On a review of this verse, the remarks of Jessien (*ubi sup. cap. iv. p. 94*) are in place: "If one carefully examine the whole passage in both writers, he will find in Jude the greatest brevity and closeness of connection; in Peter, his interpretation; in Jude, wonderful simplicity; in Peter, almost oratorical skill in the arrangement of words." Hence he argues that Jude was the earlier writer.

Passing on to Jude 6 and 2 Peter 2: 4, several striking differences between the two writers occur. In Jude there is a considerable description — the most full in Scripture — of the sin of the evil angels; in Peter, the matter is despatched in a word: "the angels that sinned." The greater fulness of Jude here, is a fulness of matter, not of mere words or ornament. In the remainder of the verse, however, the matter is essentially the same, and several of the words are the same in both writers; but the polish of the language, and the skill in the arrangement of the words, especially of the participles, is far greater in Peter. He begins with the graceful expression *οὐκ ἐφείσατο*; then, for the simple *δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις*, he puts the more elegant phrase *σειραῖς ζόφου*; and, where Jude writes plainly *εἰς κρίσιν μεγ. ἡμ. . . . ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν*, Peter expresses the same idea more artistically, *ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρ. τηρουμένους*. Surely the ordinary laws of composition indicate Peter as the later writer.

The expression *ἐκπορν. καὶ ἀπέλθουσαι ὅπ. σαρκὸς ἐτέρας*, in Jude 7, is omitted in 2 Peter 2: 6, but subsequently introduced in an altered and more elegant form in verse 10. The last clause, too, of Jude 7, compared with 2 Peter 2: 6, exhibits a striking difference. In the former, we read simply and briefly *πρόκεινται δείγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου, δίκην ὑπέχουσαι*. Peter, like one working up this idea placed before him, says, much more rhetorically, *τεφρώσας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν, ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσβεῖν τεθεικώς*.

For *κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσι*, in Jude 8, we read in 2 Peter 2: 10, *κυριότητος καταφρονούντας*. Immediately, however, the writer changes to the nominative, inserting the words *τολμηταί, αὐθάδεις*, and for the simple *δόξ. βλασφημοῦσι* of Jude, substituting the more artificial expression *δόξ. οὐ τρέμονσι βλασφημοῦντες*. The change of case admits of easy explanation, if the writer had the *δοξ. βλασφ.* of Jude before him; and the whole passage gives the impression of having been modified from the straightforward language of Jude by one skilled in the use of participles.

The chief point of difference in the illustration which occupies Jude 9 and 2 Peter 2: 11, has already been noticed. In the language may be observed, here as everywhere, Peter's verbal polishing and amplification. Instead of "Michael the archangel," he says "angels which are greater in power and might;" for the *κρίσιν βλασφημίας* of Jude, he has the more elegant *βλάβσημον κρίσιν*, and adds thereto, paraphrastically, "against them before the Lord." For the "did not dare to bring" of Jude, Peter,

indeed, writes more simply, "do not bring;" but the change is not so much a verbal one as a designed softening of the sentiment.

In the following verse, there is a clearness and closeness of connection in Jude, which is lost in the artistic construction and added epithets of Peter. This is apparent to any one who carefully compares the two passages together. Particularly striking are the expressions *ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσι βλασφημοῦντες*, and *ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καταφθαρήσονται*, in place of the much simpler language in Jude. The whole is still further amplified by the addition of the words *κομινόμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας*, which properly belong to this verse.

Comparing Jude 11 and 2 Peter 2: 15, the words in the latter *καταλιπόντες εὐθεΐαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν*, have the air of a paraphrase; and the expression *ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλ. μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν* seems like a diffuse rendering of Jude's concise *τῇ πλάνῃ τ. Βαλ. μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν*.

The verbal differences between Jude 12 and 2 Peter 2: 13 are very remarkable, but have been already mentioned. In regard to those observable between the latter part of the same verse and 2 Peter 2: 17, Jessien has well remarked (*ubi sup.* p. 102), that Jude could hardly have compiled his one verse from Peter's 13th and 17th, and then have added the original matter it contains, particularly when the connection with the preceding and following verses is taken into consideration; while Peter could easily have recurred as he pleased to Jude 12. When the two passages are compared together, it is almost impossible to resist the impression, that one of them was taken from the other. Peter introduces a new figure by the word *πηγαί*, yet, as he thereby withdraws *ἄνθρωποι* from *ρεφέλαι*, he thereby greatly weakens the force of Jude's comparison, which he still retains. One cannot fail to notice the similarity in sound between *ρεφέλαι ἄνδρες* and *πηγαί ἄνδρες*. In what follows, the general character of the illustration is the same; but each word (supposing *ὀμίχλαι* to be, as Griesbach adjudges, the true reading) is so changed as to create a slight difference in the whole figure. Jude brings before the mind light clouds of the air, borne about hither and thither by every varying breeze; Peter, the dark mist of the sea, driven impetuously before the tempest, ending with that terrible *ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα*, which Jude, a little further on, had assigned as the portion of the wandering stars. In this figure, the words used in Jude are the more common, those in second

Peter, the more recondite. The most natural way of accounting for the difference between the two, is, by supposing the *πηγ. ἄν.* to have been suggested by the *ρεφ. ἄν.*, and, after adopting it, Peter still wished to retain the figure of the *ρεφ. παραφερ.* which he has done in its general scope, but with different language, and not caring to use all the comparisons furnished by Jude, he has closed the figure with the last words of Jude's succession of figures — *οἷς ὁ ζόφος κ. τ. λ.*

The clause in Jude 16, *τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν ὑπέρογκα λαλεῖ*, is far more artistically expressed in 2 Peter 2: 18, *ὑπέρ. γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι*. And the simple expression *θανυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ἀφελείας χάριν*, is greatly amplified and repeated in 2 Peter 2: 14 and 18, in the clauses beginning with *δεδεάζοντες* and *δεδεάζονσι*.

The difference between Jude 17 and 2 Peter 3: 2, is quite remarkable. The words *τῶν ἀγίων προφητῶν* are inserted in the midst of the clause by Peter, precisely as if he had Jude's epistle before him, and, wishing to omit the prophecy of Enoch given in Jude 14, 16, would yet retain a trace of the argument to be drawn therefrom. In Jude, the verse is compact and its connection close; in second Peter, this clause is almost parenthetical. The *καὶ τῆς ἐντολῆς* is added in the latter, and also the word *ἡμῶν* is inserted, with a construction so harsh as by itself to suggest the probability of its having been thrust into a sentence already written. At the close of the verse, Peter adds *Σωτῆρος*, which, from 1: 1, 11; 2: 20; 3: 18 and this passage, seems to have been a favorite title with him, although it does not occur in the first epistle at all.

The simple *ἐν ἐσχάτῳ χρόνῳ* in Jude 18, Peter, with his accustomed skill in the moulding of words, changes (3: 3) to *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν*; and the *ἔσονται ἐμπαίικται το ελεύσονται ἐν ἐμπαιμονῇ ἐμπαίικται*; and for his *τὰς ἐαντ. ἐπιθ.* writes more emphatically *τὰς ιδίας ἐπιθ. αὐτ.*

Beyond this point, the coincidence between the two epistles is less close, although a distinct parallel is still observable between Jude 21 and 24 and 2 Peter 3: 14, 17, 18. The closing doxology of Jude is much more rich and full than that of Peter.

The result of this comparison of the verbal resemblances and differences between the two writers, is, that, while here and there a point is found on which, taken separately, it would be possible to base a feeble inference for the priority of Peter's epistle,

almost every verse presents some indication, more or less strong, that Peter wrote with the epistle of Jude before him.

The same result has been reached independently by the consideration of the other elements in the remarkable likeness between the two epistles, of the probable authority of the two writers, of their different address, and of the general character of their epistles. The inference in each case may not be decisive in itself; but there is strength in the combination. When it is once admitted that the two epistles could not have been written independently of each other, an admission to which we are irresistibly forced, it is, of course, admitted at the same time, either that they were written conjointly, or else that one must have been written after the other, and with reference to the other. The former theory no one appears to advocate, and the question is thus brought within narrow limits. Neither epistle refers directly to the other; there is no reliable historic evidence; and the greatest possible interval between them is altogether too short to have wrought any perceptible change in the language. The question of priority must depend, therefore, for its solution, upon such indications of originality as may be observed in the one, and such appearances of an opposite character as may be found in the other.

These points have now been discussed at length. In conclusion, it may suffice to say, that the style of Peter is ornate, and at times almost artificial; that of Jude is simple, compact and direct. The style of Peter is well suited to paraphrase and amplification, while that of Jude has too much nerve and vigor for an epitome. In the language of the rhetoricians, Jude's skill is conspicuous in *invention*, Peter's in *composition*. Fulness of thought and rapidity of illustration are peculiarly characteristic of the epistle of the former. The epistle of Jude, on its face, bears no appearance of having been wrought out from the epistle of Peter; on the other hand, there are indications of Peter's having written with the epistle of Jude before him. There are many matters in second Peter of which there is not the slightest trace in Jude; but, with the exception of a few passages for the omission of which a reason can easily be imagined, there is nothing in Jude which is not also found substantially in second Peter. The illustrations throughout favor the supposition that those of Jude were first written, those of Peter formed from them. The connection of the parts is clear and compact in Jude; in second

Peter the language often becomes involved, as if the writer were moulding his epistle upon the former work of Jude; and, as often as he wandered away in paraphrase and amplification, sought to return to the point at which he had departed from his model. Finally, the details of the language, almost everywhere, present Peter as polishing, ornamenting and amplifying the straightforward, inartificial language of Jude.

These facts are believed to be the result of a fair comparison of the epistles. Any one can test them for himself. It must be left to the judgment of the reader to decide to how much weight they are entitled. To the mind of the writer they are quite sufficient to establish the priority of the epistle of Jude.

In concluding this Article, however, it may not be amiss to allude to some of the consequences which flow from the admission of the priority of the epistle of Jude; consequences of sufficient importance to justify the labor of the investigation.

In the first place, we obtain, at once, a fixed limit below which the date of this epistle cannot be carried. The time of Peter's death is known with sufficient certainty, and, as his second epistle (of course, assuming its genuineness) must have been written before then, its date cannot be later than A. D. 67 or 68, and must be placed several years earlier still, if Cave's determination of the death of Peter to A. D. 64 be admitted. Taking the latest date, however, it follows that the epistle of Jude must have been written before A. D. 68. As its matter shows it to have been written sometime after the general diffusion of the Gospel, we thus obtain such narrow limits within which to fix its date, that, by assigning it to the year of our Lord 65, we cannot be very far wrong.

The step thus gained is important in many ways. It is a help to the solution of the much vexed question concerning the prophecy of Enoch contained in verses 14 and 15. For the "Book of Enoch," from which Jude has been often supposed to have quoted, is assigned by many, perhaps most, critics, to a later date. It would not be difficult, indeed, to prove that this apocryphal book is a composition of a period later than any possible date of the epistle of Jude; but it is satisfactory to know that, even if we admit the arguments of those who refer its publication to the close of the first century, we are still safe in maintaining that it cannot possibly have been quoted by Jude.

Passing by other uses to be made of the determination of this

question, such as its bearing upon the genuineness and authority of the epistle of Jude, we are struck with the insight hereby given into the state of the Christian church within less than two-score years of its foundation. From the other epistles of the same period we learn, it is true, essentially the same facts; but here we look upon them from a different point of view, and, as it were, through the mind of another inspired writer. We find here the full verification of our Saviour's parables of the wheat and the tares, of the net gathering fish, good and bad; and we are certain that the church must have made great progress, before it could have been exposed to the dangers here mentioned, and before wicked men could have thought it worth their while surreptitiously to enter the Christian fold. We learn, too, how very short a time was necessary for the growth of corruptions in Christian doctrine, and how, from the earliest period, a certain fixed body of truth had been established, a "faith once delivered to the saints," to be earnestly contended for, as it is, without improvement and without change.

In a word, the whole epistle appears in quite a different light, if it be considered as belonging to A. D. 90, or as having been published A. D. 65. And, although its direct teaching is in either case the same, yet the information to be incidentally gained from it depends very much upon whether it was written five-and-twenty years earlier or later.

The earlier date is nearer than the later to what may be called the balance of the various dates adopted by the learned.

ARTICLE VII.

MAN AND HIS FOOD.

By Leonard Withington, D. D., Newbury, Mass.

EATING is one of the lowest enjoyments of a rational being, and yet necessary to our repose and our mental speculations. If a man will not work neither shall he eat; but it is equally clear that, if he does not eat, neither can he work. There is no

character which raises such perfect contempt as a glutton; we despise him more, though he is not a greater sinner, than the drunkard; and when we read in historical record that the great Caesar, the warrior, the conqueror, the orator, the statesman, the only man, as Cato said, that *came sober to the subversion of his country*, was accustomed, when invited to a feast, to whet his appetite by taking an emetic, we can scarcely believe the story, though so well attested;¹ and we come to the conclusion that not all the glories which blazed around his brow, can rescue this part of his character, and certainly this vice, from contempt. The old allegorical poet has given us a picture of gluttony which certainly embodies the common feelings of mankind against it:

"And by his side rode loathsome Gluttony,
Deformed creature on a filthie swyne;
His belly was upblown with luxury,
And eke with fatnesse swollen was his eyne;
And like a crane his necke was long and fyne,
With which he swallowed up excessive feast,
For want whereof poor people oft did pyne:
And all the way, most like a brutish beast,
He spued up his gorge, that all did him deteast.

In greene vine leaves he was ryht fitly clad;
For other clothes he could not wear for heate;
And on his head an yvieve garland had,
From under which fast trickled down the sweate.
Still as he rode he somewhat still did eat,
And in his hand did beare a bouzing can,
Of which he sipt so oft, that in his seat
His drunken corse he scarce upholden can;
In shape and life more like a monster then a man.

Unfit he was for any worldly thing,
And eke unhable once to stirre, or go;
Not meet to be of counsell to a king,
Whose mind in meat and drinke is drowned so,
That from his frend he seldom knew his fo;
Full of diseases was his carcas blew,
And a dry dropsie through his flesh did flow,
Which by misdiet daily greater grew:
Such one was Gluttony, the second of that crew."

Faery Queen, B. I. Canto IV. 21—23.

¹ Vide *Epistolas ad Atticum*, 52. Lib. XIII. *Unctus est; accubuit; ἐμπερικλινέσθαι*. Itaque edit et bibit ἀδελφῆς et jucunde, etc. It is more remarkable as Caesar was regarded as a model of Roman temperance. Vini parcissimum ne inimici quidem negaverunt; and Cato said, *unum ex omnibus ad evertendam Remp. sobrium accessisse*.—*Suetonius, Vita*, c. 53.

But this deformed vice is the abuse of a natural appetite. Take away from the astronomer his food, and he will soon cease to lift his telescope to the stars. The saint, the martyr, the moralist, and the poet, all pursue their sublime occupations through the vigor and animation of the body. In a word, as the sweetest blossom on the highest tree, though it seems to be fed by the very air which it decorates, is nourished by the dirt and manure around the roots of the tree, so the sublimest mind is supplied by the food of the body. Man does not live on bread alone, but, in order to live, he certainly needs bread.

In the Old Testament, food is used as a signal of celestial blessings. "He should have fed thee also with the finest of the wheat and with honey out of the rock should I have satisfied thee." These are not the aliments of savage man. We are instructed in the Bible to pray for our daily bread; we should be abundantly thankful whenever it is given. Nay, we are instructed not to be totally indifferent to the *kind* of food, for discrimination here is connected with other discrimination, and indicates improvement in the taste. We will not take advantage of Dr. Johnson's remark, who held that he who did not mind his dinner, would scarcely mind anything else. Suffice it to say, that taste in food and taste in dress, science, and literature, always go together. He that feeds grossly will judge grossly; and God himself has promised the finest of the wheat as a reward to obedience, and probably as a means of improvement. "Ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh; for the life of all flesh is the blood thereof; whosoever eateth it shall be cut off. And every soul that eateth that which died of itself, or that which was torn with beasts (whether it be one of your own country or a stranger), he shall both wash his clothes and bathe himself in water and be unclean until the even, then he shall be clean." Lev. 17: 14, 15. The eleventh chapter of Leviticus is a remarkable chapter. Let any one consider the gier-eagle as the filthy bird is described by naturalists, and then ask why such a walking abomination is forbidden to man.¹

When we look over the world, we find every variety in the

¹ The *vultur percnopterus*. "The appearance of the bird is as horrid as can well be imagined. The face is naked and wrinkled, the eyes large and black, the beak black and crooked, the talons large and extended for prey; and the whole body polluted with filth." — See Natural History of the Bible, by Dr. Harris of Dorchester, p. 182.

human family, from the Esquimaux, who lives among the icebergs of Greenland, to the very *delicate lady* of our glittering cities, *who would not venture to set the sole of her foot upon the ground for delicateness and tenderness*. Some people reach the top of refinement and seem by their skill almost to command nature, and some are at the bottom of the scale and are the slaves of nature's severest powers. What an amazing difference! What variety! We may almost conclude with Dr. Watts: "I could even venture to say that the improvement of reason hath raised the learned and prudent in the European world almost as much above the Hottentots and other savages of Africa, as those savages are by nature superior to the birds, the beasts, and the fishes."¹ We have not only these extremes, but all the intermediate states between them. There are the refined and doubly refined; the civilized and the over-civilized; the plain, the coarse; the rustic, the ignorant; the savage, the barbarous, the brutal. We have the poet, *with his eye in a fine frenzy rolling*, and the man whose bodily wants press him to the dust, and conceal from him the secret that he has any mental fire. But in all these gradations, which differ as much as the tallest oak that intercepts the sun from the meanest weed that shares its shade, you will find that these men differ in their food; that their food indicates the degree of improvement, and that their low state, if their state be low, is caused and continued by an improper and scanty diet. "He feedeth on ashes, a deceived heart hath turned him aside that he cannot deliver his soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?"

All historians seem to agree in tracing the history of man from his purest refinements up to the grossest barbarism.² Such was Greece, and such was Rome, before their meridian of grandeur

¹ Watts's Logic, Introduction, p. 1.

² A popular orator would best represent the common opinion. Hear Cicero: Quis enim vestrum, judices. ignorat, ita naturam rerum tulisse, ut quodam tempore homines, nondum neque naturali, neque civili jure descripto, fusi per agros ac dispersi vagarentur, tantumque haberent, quantum manu ac viribus per eadem ac vulnera aut eripere aut retinere potuissent? Qui igitur primi virtute et consilio praestanti extiterunt, ii perspecto genere humanae docilitatis atque ingenii dissipatos, unum in locum congregarunt, eosque ex feritate illa ad justitiam atque mansuetudinem transdixerunt. Tum res ad communem utilitatem, quas publicas appellamus, tum conventicula hominum, quae postea civitates nominatae sunt, tum domicilia conjuncta, quas urbes dicimus, invento et divino et humano jure, moenibus saepserunt. — *Oratio pro Sextio*, Sect. 42.

and improvement. If it was so, it must have been that this barbarism was a terrible degeneracy from a previous state of refinement and elevation; it must be the shoals and flats of a tide which had ebbed out and was to reflow; for God made *man upright*, though they have *sought out many inventions*. Certainly there was no want in Eden; there bloomed the tree of life, and there it was said: "Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed which is on the face of all the earth, and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree, yielding seed, to you it shall be for meat." This was a state not only of the highest civilization, but innocence; when man fell, he was followed by the provisions of grace. Depravity, to be sure, tends downward. Religion and civilization are intimately connected. We read that Cain *went out from the presence of the Lord*, that is, from the ordinances and restraints of religion. Perhaps thousands, in various ages, have *degenerated* into barbarism. Perhaps the fallacy of the old speculators, such as Aristotle, Thucydides, Diodorus Siculus and Cicero, was, that they mistook a factitious for a primitive state. Barbarism was the state to which man *sunk*, rather than civilization the state to which he *rose*. At any rate, all the profane historians and philosophers trace the rise of nations by slow degrees from the most abject depression.

Poetry told of a time when men lived on acorns and dwelt in caves:

quum frigida parvas
Præberet spelunca domos, ignemque, laremque,¹

and it is likely through these gleams of fiction we see some truth. But it is certain, with such food they must be in the lowest stage of improvement. There must be no discrimination, no knowledge, no taste, no books, no arts, no statesmen among them. They have not the use of iron, and therefore are a feeble and helpless race. They must be lazy and inefficient; and even their temperance must be the effect of ignorant necessity. The next stage would be to live on wild meat; this would imply a little greater progress. They must have some weapons of war, and some of the arts of hunting. In this state, one remove from the lowest, were the savages of this continent found, when our fathers came hither to confront native imbecility with civilized

¹ Juvenal, Sect. VI. line 2 and 3.

improvement. In this condition were the most powerful tribes found; and what was their condition? It took as many acres to support one family as would now support whole brigades.¹ One interminable dark, green forest overshadowed the soil; the wolf howled in the meadow; the bear climbed the tree; the owl shrieked in the swamp; and a few patches of Indian corn were feebly cultivated in the most favorable places. The most dreaded nations, the Iroquois, could not muster half the able-bodied men that are now found in Haverhill or Lawrence; and they occupied about the whole of western New York. Their food was an INDICATION of their standing, and a cause of their barbarism. They were not fed with the *finest of the wheat*, though they might occasionally get *honey from the rock*. They were always on the verge of starvation; for, if plenty came, their prodigality and profusion soon dissipated it, and the dreadful phantom of want was always before them. Every winter they endured privations which would glorify a martyr or a hermit. They had no high speculations, no literary employment, no elevating pursuits, no seasons of calm meditation. They saw the sun by day and the stars by night, without the least curiosity to ask their nature, or study their motions. They had no earnest pursuit but war, and no exciting pleasure but revenge. It was their highest delight to torture a captive, and, when the poor victim died under their prolonged cruelties, they tore out his heart and literally drank his blood. Now these demons in human shape were not naturally worse than other men. They bore in their bosoms all the elements of human nature; its powers, its sympathies, its tendency to regeneration, and its capacity for improvement. The fact is, their ferocity was made by their condition; and nothing had a greater effect than their food, and the sparing and precarious way in which it came to them. They got it without regular industry; it required little preparation, or foresight; they consumed it with gluttony, and then they fasted like martyrs. Their winter evenings were long and monotonous; and, when

¹ Between the Mississippi on the west and the ocean on the east, between the Ohio on the south and Lake Superior and the other chain of lakes on the north, the whole Indian population at the close of the French war, 1758, did not greatly exceed 10,000 fighting men. All men who could lift a tomahawk were fighting men. — See Parkman's *Life of Pontiac*.

Had such barbarism a right to the soil on the abstract idea of property; an idea which the very purchasers were obliged to put into their heads when they first bought of them?

the war-whoop summoned them to battle, they rallied out, like hungry wolves, for the complex object of finding food and gratifying their revenge. A hungry man always feels the risings of cruelty, however they may be conquered by nobler principle. When you think of the cruelty of an Indian, you should always think of his famished condition. *Men do not despise the thief of civilization, if he steal to satisfy his soul, when hungry.* How much less the poor uninstructed savage! Think of his surroundings, his wilderness, his rocks, his trees, his hunger, his passion, his fiery temper, his ignorance and his desolation. God alone, who appointed his place, can judge his infirmities. God may have mercy on his soul. When he sends him the Gospel, he will give him the double bread.

It is important to remember, however, that there are varieties and degrees in the life below the proper line of civilization. The savage nations are found in various stages of improvement. Dr. Robertson was certainly deceived when he compared the Gauls and Germans to the tribes on our continent.¹ The Helvetii, as we find in Caesar, were comparatively a great people; they were divided into hundreds and villages; they planned a migration from their land two years before it was to take place; they laid up the necessary provisions; they had their statistics recorded in the Greek letters, all which are signals of improvement beyond the reach and conception of our Indians. In the account of Tacitus, the Suevi are a very different people from the Fenns, of whom it is said: *mira feritas, foeda paupertas; non arma, non equi, non Penates; victui herba, vestui pelles, cubile humus.*² These few words give a complete insight into their condition. The nomadic state, also, is a peculiar and distinct one. They feed on hunted meat, like venison, but especially delight in milk and horse-flesh. The modern Tartars are an example.

But the next step in the upward grade is a very important one, and that is, when a people come to live on wheat, or as Revela-

¹ See Cæsar, Commentaries, Lib. I. c. 3. *Somewhere* in Gaul, Cæsar found their statistics recorded in the Greek language. How immensely above our Indians! We are not sure it was the Helvetii that had the Greek letters. See Dr. Robertson's note, Charles V. Vol. I. note VI. F, where he compares the Gauls to our aborigines, though he afterwards allows some difference. There was very great difference. Had the Gauls conquered a civilized land, they would have organized and risen, whereas our savage predecessors would probably have destroyed and sank.

² See Tacitus, De Moribus Germaniæ, Sect. 46.

tion says: "God feeds them with the finest wheat;" they are now transformed into another people. The old poet, with profound philosophy, has noticed this:

Prima Ceres unco glebam dimovit aratro,
Prima dedit fruges, alimentaque mitia terris,
Prima dedit leges.¹

That is, Ceres, the goddess of corn, first moved the glebe by the crooked ploughshare; first gave to man the various kinds of grain as better food, and she, also, first gave them laws. Now remark, how the poet has linked these things together. You are told that a people are a wheat-eating people. Of course, they must raise it; they must have the plough and the ploughshare; they must command iron, or, at least, some hard metal; they must understand the process of mining and smelting; they must have fields and fences; they must have foresight to sow and patience to wait for a crop; and, finally, they must be protected by law, for no one will lend the labor who is not assured of the protection, and thus the poet tells us, Ceres — *Prima dedit leges* — first gave laws to mankind. All this marks a cultivated and comparatively improved people. We have reached the borders of civilization; we have passed the fence that separates the forest from the fallow ground, and yet, we presume, there was a time when the wheat-stem was a wild plant, growing almost unnoticed and unknown.² We have seen, on the margin of our sea, a grass growing, which seemed to be intended by prolific nature for a farinaceous plant; it might, perhaps, be improved into a new species of food. The line that joins the sea to the shore, is an important line; it has been the cradle of blessings. There humanity flourishes, and there the Father of fer-

¹ See Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, Lib. V. 340—342. What a poet! how profound; how silly; how licentious; how moral! What opulence of fancy and what luxury of imagination wasted on Tom-Thumb stories. Was there ever before such a combination! He will sometimes give you the most natural picture of the most natural sorrow in the most unnatural condition, a woman, for example, turning into a tree. You weep at the sentiment and laugh at the story in the same breath. You often stumble on the profoundest aphorism, beautifully expressed, at the close of the most extravagant narrative.

² However, the use of wheat has been so long known, that its origin is unknown. It might have sprouted in Eden, under the branches of the tree of life. — See an Address of Gen. Dearborn before the Agricultural Society of Norfolk County.

tility drops his richest gifts. "Now as he walked by the sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and Andrew his brother." Life, spiritual and animal, is often found on the border of the sea.

When our Lord, who knew the force of all symbols, and how to select the best, instituted the sacramental supper, the tokens of the feast were BREAD and WINE.

When man has reached a certain point of civilization, he is sure to go on. Just as an imprisoned pond of water, if an outlet be once made, is sure to flow. All alone wheat may be called a luxury. But it is a significant luxury. The introduction of SUGAR, for example, has changed the whole face of society. The Bible, in two places at least, speaks of the sweet cane. Isaiah 43: 24: "Thou hast bought me no sweet cane with money, neither hast thou filled me with the fat of sacrifices." So in Jer. 6: 20: "To what purpose cometh there to me incense from Sheba, and sweet cane from a far country?" This is supposed by some to be the sugar-cane. It was known long before its riches were explored or its use appreciated. It was known as the flag-root is now known, something that is prized by boys. A writer in the thirteenth century speaks of a new salt, which they had found, whose taste was sweet, and recommends that lumps of it be put into the mouths of sick people, it would be soothing and cooling.¹ It was used as a medicine, then as a luxury, until by degrees it became a necessary of life. People no longer talked of *honey out of the rock*. It was found to be one of the purest and least cloying sweets ever discovered. It was handed from the Arabs to the Spaniards; it was cultivated first in the Madeira Islands; then it was given to all the European nations; was raised in the West Indies on an immense scale. Then came rum, brandy, and all the alcoholic drinks, slavery and all its consequences, until now it is a debated problem whether the sweet cane was a blessing or a curse. At any rate, this single article of food, so unimportant and neglected in its origin, changed the whole face of society. So that sugar now is a Moloch and an angel. One of its wings is iron, and one fringed with gold; in one hand, is a cup filled with the sweetest beverage, and in the other, a "cup and the wine is red, it is full of mixture, and he poureth out the same, but the dregs thereof all the wicked of the earth shall wring them out and drink them." Wring them out! that is,

¹ See the Penny Magazine.

subject them to the torturing still, and turn them into a maddening beverage.

One of the most remarkable articles of food in its influence on social happiness is rice. It comes to us very demurely with an innocent aspect, almost a Quaker in simplicity, and yet its effects are very doubtful. It promises more than it performs, and its excellence is its defect. In the first place, the cultivation is very destructive of life and comfort. The work will be performed by none but slaves; secondly, in most countries where lassitude accompanies abstinence, they are strongly tempted to make it their chief article of food; and, thirdly, the failure of one crop produces famine. Hence we are constantly hearing of famine on the banks of the Ganges. It marks a civilized, but not an enterprising, land.

Our readers must all have heard of Sir Walter Raleigh, the scholar, the statesman, the warrior, the historian, the discoverer, the philosopher, and even the poet; the man whose comprehensive mind joined the most distant perfections, and yet whose irregular greatness compels the assent of his friends to his defects, and of his enemies to his virtues. His mind was like the soil around Mount Aetna, where the olive-tree and the lava are found together. Surely America ought to venerate his memory. He was the father and patron of one of our oldest settlements — Virginia. He is said to have introduced into England two articles, one a useless luxury and the other an important improvement, tobacco and the potato. The last article is questioned in the late Report on the Census, as to its having Raleigh for its introduction into England: "The common English and Irish potato (*Solanum tuberosum*), so extensively cultivated throughout most of the temperate countries of the civilized globe, contributing as it does to the necessities of a large portion of the human race, as well as to the nourishment and fattening of stock, is regarded as of but little less importance in our national economy than maize, wheat or rice. It has been found in an indigenous state in Chili, on the mountains near Valparaiso and Mendoza; also near Montevideo, Lima, Quito, as well as in Santa Fé de Bogota, and more recently in Mexico on the banks of the Orizaba.

"The history of this plant, in connection with that of the sweet potato, is involved in obscurity, as the accounts of their introduction into Europe are somewhat conflicting, and often they

appear to be confounded with one another. The common kind was doubtless introduced into Spain in the early part of the sixteenth century, from the neighborhood of Quito, where, as well as in all Spanish countries, the tubers are known as *papas*. The first published account of it we find on record is in *La Cronica del Peru*, by Pedro de Cieca, printed in Seville, in 1553, in which it is described and illustrated by an engraving. From Spain it seems to have found its way into Italy, where it assumed the same name as the truffle. It was received by Clusius, at Vienna, in 1598, in whose time it spread rapidly in the south of Europe, and even into Germany. To England, it is said to have found its way by a different route, having been brought from Virginia by Raleigh's colonists in 1586, which would seem improbable, as it was unknown in North America at that time, either wild or cultivated; and, besides, Gough, in his edition of Camden's *Brittania*, says, it was first planted by Sir Walter Raleigh on his estate at Youghal, near Cork, and that it was cultivated in Ireland before its value was known in England. Gerard, in his *Herbal*, published in 1597, gives a figure of this plant under the name of *Batata Virginiana*, to distinguish it from the sweet potato, *Batata Edulis*, and recommends the root to be eaten as a 'delicate dish' but not as a common food. 'The sweet potato,' says Sir Joseph Banks, 'was used in England as a delicacy long before the introduction of our potatoes; it was imported in considerable quantities from Spain and the Canaries, and was supposed to possess the power of restoring decayed vigor.' It is related, that the common potato was accidentally introduced into England from Ireland, at a period somewhat earlier than that noticed by Gerard, in consequence of the wrecking of a vessel on the coasts of Lancashire which had a quantity on board. In 1663, the Royal Society of England took measures for encouraging the cultivation of this vegetable, with the view of preventing famine. Notwithstanding its utility as a food became better known, no high character was attached to it; and the writers on gardening, towards the end of the seventeenth century, a hundred years after its introduction, treated it indifferently. 'They are much used in Ireland and America as bread,' says one author, 'and may be propagated with advantage to poor people.' The famous nursery-men, London and Wise, did not consider it worthy of notice, in their *Complete Gardener*, published in 1719. But its use gradually spread, and

its excellence became better understood. It was near the middle of the last century before it was generally known either in Britain or North America, since which it has been most extensively cultivated."¹

It is curious to see how these conservatives of gulosity speak of a plant, whose failure fills half the world with lamentation. They describe it as a root found in the new world, consisting of little knobs, held together by strings; if you boil it well, it *can* be eaten; it *may* become an article of food; it will certainly do for hogs, and, though it is rather acid and flatulent in the human stomach, perhaps, if you boil it with dates, it may serve to keep soul and body together among those who can find nothing better. Thus the potato, like other reformers, found his inventions long rejected; and, had he been as short lived as we mortals, his praises would only have flourished on his tomb.

What though no weeping Lover thy ashes grace,
Nor polished marble emulate thy face?
What though no sacred earth allow thee room,
Nor hallowed dirge be muttered o'er thy tomb;
Yet shall thy grave with rising flowers be dressed
And the green turf lie lightly on thy breast.
There shall the morn her earliest tears bestow,
There the first roses of the year shall blow;
While Angels, with their silver wings o'ershade
The ground, now sacred by thy relics made.

Let not the reader smile, if, in this connection, we introduce dainty children. There is a mystery about this subject, on which we may well bestow a passing thought. There is a class of children who are very difficult about their food, nor is this fastidiousness confined to the progeny of the rich, who are pampered with cake. These little connoisseurs cannot eat with the rest of the family, and the mother and the son are often at issue in an interminable controversy. The mother often says, it is all whim and caprice, and some severe matrons tell their children that they shall not eat a morsel until the given lump is devoured. But the son would say, if he could quote Shakspeare, "You cramb these things into mine ear against the stomach of my sense. I know I don't love it; I can't eat it, it is not fit to be eaten." Now how is this? Is this turn of the appetite a matter

¹ See the Report of the Superintendent of the Census for 1850, p. 71.

of caprice or necessity? Is the mother right or the boy? The controversy has been carried on for ages, and we have no doubt that Eve had it with Cain and Abel the first supper she gave them after they were weaned. We offer it as a profound conjecture that Cain was a dainty boy, and probably doubled up his fist at his mother. It is likely in this dispute (as in many others) both parties are partly wrong. That much depends on the training and volition, there can be no doubt; but much depends also on original nature and temperament. There are some things which we were never made for, and they were never made for us. There are some kinds of food, which, though they may suit the race, were never made for the *individual*. But this blended appetite, partly natural, partly artificial, follows through life. It appears in the prices of provision. Take the case of the finest teas imported from China, which employ many ships and sailors, and keep the eastern trade in motion. We have no doubt there is many a weed growing in our fields and mountains, which we might be TRAINED UP to relish and value as much as we now do the best Hyson, Gunpowder, Imperial, Oolong and Ninyong, and any other barbarous names by which we justify our luxury. Our delicacies depend partly upon nature, partly upon fashion and habit, partly upon original and partly upon directed taste. The modifications depend on no eternal law — though there may be, under all our fluctuations, a subjacent perpetuity — even as the Mississippi must always flow somewhere near its present bed, though a thousand floods, and some every season, may alter the minuteness of its channel.

Thus we have endeavored to show how civilization has enlarged the circle of supply, and how much it depends upon the supply. Man must have his pressing wants alleviated, before he will rise into the world of thinking and noble action. Just as the bird must be fed in the nest, before he can expand his wings and soar into the air. We must have his root before we can have the flower. And now let us move the question, whether we have reached the terminus of all our stores; and, whether no other articles of food are to be introduced to the table from the forest, the field, the rivers, or the sea. Have we reached the line of our last inventions, and is there no new article to be discovered, which is to have an equal influence on virtue and happiness? Certainly there can be no doubt on this point. Boundless nature lies before us, and undeveloped skill is wrapt up in the human breast.

The exuberance of our system is not exhausted; her beasts, her birds, her fishes, her plants, her growing trees and her copious grasses, her pastures, her valleys, her lofty mountains, and her rolling streams, are all spread out to the hungry world. Nature is an image of God, and she echoes, though she does not originate, the words: "In my Father's house is bread enough and to spare." "Thou visitest the earth and waterest it; thou greatly enrichest it with the river of God, which is full of water; thou preparedst them corn when thou hast so provided for it. Thou waterest the ridges thereof abundantly; thou settlest the furrows thereof; thou makest it soft with showers; thou blessest the springing thereof."

The way in which food operates upon intellect and character is no mystery. Though an infidel may say that man is a physical being; though Helvetius may teach that the mental difference between a man and a horse is, that one has a hand and the other a hoof; though Voltaire may pretend

"Bonne ou mauvaise santé

Fait notre philosophie;"¹

the cause is very different. POVERTY IS A TEMPTATION. Extreme poverty is a great temptation. Now this temptation is diminished as we multiply his comforts and increase the supply. Avarice, it seems to me, will one day be ashamed of her carking care and her wrinkled brow, and generosity will look on her flowing streams and growing heaps, and double her efforts to remove the wants of the poor, and promote the praises of God.

Let us, then, propose this problem to all who are willing to join in its speedy solution. How shall we increase the circle of our supplies to the amplitude of nature? It was the idea of the old poets, that many unpublished virtues were found in plants and flowers, which might heal our diseases and mitigate our pains.

O much is the powerful grace, that lies

In herbs, plants, stones, and their true qualities;

For nought so vile that on the earth doth live,

But to the earth some special good doth give.²

¹ See Notes on Pascal, Vol. II. p. 176. Paris edition. 1812, Renard,

² Shakspeare.

But surely we may, with better reason, suppose that there are magazines of food yet to be discovered; and, that the manna, which is hereafter to be provided, will not be rained down from heaven, but will spring up from the earth.

That God is not indifferent to the influence of food on our character, is evident from the interdictions in the eleventh chapter of Leviticus. We need not look very deep for the causes of some of those discriminations.¹ As there are some actions so mean, so gross, and so indecent, that a good man must avoid them, though prohibited by no positive law, so there are some beasts and reptiles, so revolting, that cultivated people cannot select them for food. The word *obscene*, applied by the poets to birds and animals, perhaps well conveys the indefinite, the illogical, but perhaps, after all, very clear idea. You feel that you cannot feast on such things and preserve your self-respect. The thing is unclean, and you are filthy, if you dare to touch it. You want delicacy (yes, moral delicacy, too) if your gorge does not rise at it. When we read in Pomponius Mela: "*Troglodytae, nullarum opum domini, strident magis quam loquuntur, specus subeunt, alunturque serpentibus,*"² we feel that these things admirably go together. We need no ghost to come and tell us that these people would be miserable judges of Grecian architecture, and would have as little relish for the finest descriptions of Homer, as they would for any better food than the snakes which they gobble down to prolong their own reptile existence.

It is remarkable to see how many things God could afford to throw away, in the densely peopled land of ancient Canaan. We are not sure that one collateral design was not to confute the starving theory of Malthus. It certainly *does* confute it; for that theory is as clearly false, as the word of God is clearly true.

Something is wrong in our present system of dietetics. We do not eat the good of the land; for, without going to the extravagance of Graham and Dr. Alcott, we have not trained our taste to the amplitude or simplicity of nature.³ There is one proof

¹ See Spencer, Michaelis, Lowman, Jahn, Dr. Harris of Dorchester. They have all looked very deep for the causes of the discrimination in food related in the eleventh chapter of Leviticus.

² De Situ Orbis, Lib. I. c. viii. Cyrenaica.

³ In our relishes of the palate, as in our colors, and forms of dress, there is a line where habit and nature meet, a permanent line, which it is desirable to find

that the poverty of art has usurped the riches of nature; that we neglect the useful to adopt the pernicious, namely: **THE EARLY DECAY OF THE TEETH OF THE RISING GENERATION.** It is a growing evil, and we cannot but ask what it signifies. We know no devourer below man that eats up its own teeth. Nature made our bodies to last; and, when any part of them prematurely decay, it is a certain sign we have violated some of her fundamental laws.

Two objects, then, are before us, and let no one smile if we insist on their importance. One is, to import from the open field of nature all those good and wholesome things which our Father has laid up for us;¹ and, secondly, to train our taste and habits for the using of those things which are nutritive and sweet, and which may have the best influence on our moral character and social happiness.²

There are *many things* which we shall never throw away, but we are equally clear that there are *some things* which we shall yet discover.

Horace laughs at the Romans for eating the peacock, because his plumage was fine:

Num vesceris istâ,
Quam laudas, plumâ?³

One relic of this folly we have. We pay a higher price for

and rest on. Thus, gaudy colors please at first, but plainer ones meet our improved and permanent taste. Now what is the food that will always be pleasing, always healthful, and always abundant?

Τῶν δ' ὅστις λωτοῖοο γάγος μελιθδεά καρπὸν,
Οὐκετ' ἀπαγγεῖλαι πάλιν ἤθελεν, οὐδὲ νεῖσθαι.

Odyssey, Lib. IX. lines 94, 95.

¹ One advantage of providing such food as is permanently grateful and wholesome will be, that students and professional gentlemen will not be tempted to eat too much. A copious source of disease and suffering! A gentleman in this vicinity has written the following recipe, on which he stakes his reputation as a poet and a philanthropist:

"Your sickness, languor and distress
You often might restore,
If you would eat a little less
And work a little more."

² The evil of smoking cigars, chewing tobacco, etc., is, that it tends to pervert and ruin this permanent taste for the wholesome and the good.

³ See Satir, II. Lib. II. lines 26, 27.

the white flour that looks well, than for the coarse wheat which is far more nutritive and far more palatable. When the last treasures are discovered; when we have brought fashion and nature together;

Then, like the Sun, let bounty spread her ray,
And shine that superfluity away.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE TEMPTATION IN THE WILDERNESS.

By William A. Stearns, D. D., Cambridge, Mass.

In attempting to explain the transaction recorded in Matthew 4: 1—11, Mark 1: 12, 13, and Luke 4: 1—15, we do not forget that the subject is mysterious, and should be approached with awe. It comprehends a deep spiritual philosophy. Its interpretation is beset with difficulties. We have never met with any satisfactory commentary upon it. Nor shall we be disappointed if our own explanation should fail of commending itself to all. The subject, however, is exceedingly important, and invites study. If we are able to make even a small contribution towards a proper understanding of it, we shall not feel that we have labored in vain.

1. The circumstances under which the temptation occurred. It took place at the commencement of our Lord's ministry. In the history of his experience, it followed a season of high spiritual exaltation. He had just received baptism; the heavens had been opened unto him; the Spirit had descended upon him; the Father had said, in a voice from heaven, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," and, according to Luke, he was at that time full of the Holy Ghost. These are the circumstances, and such was the state of mind, under which he was conducted to the scene of temptation.

2. The *time* occupied with this event. It is commonly spoken of as forty days and forty nights. But the record shows that

forty days and forty nights elapsed since he was led up into the wilderness, before the three special temptations here mentioned, commenced. "And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights," says Matthew, "he was *afterward* an hungered." Luke is equally explicit. He says, that when the forty days and forty nights "were ended, he *afterward* hungered." We have no means of exactly limiting the time. The three temptations may have occurred on the fortieth day, or the first on that day, and the second and third at intervals of some days after. Nor are these three temptations the only ones to which our Lord was subjected. As he was led into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil, the natural inference is, that the whole forty days was a scene of conflict. Accordingly Marks says, that he was "in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan:" and Luke says, that he was forty days tempted of the devil, after which time the three great master-plots were brought to bear upon him. Nor is there anything in the *record* to indicate that the *first* of these *three* temptations was the first of all the temptations to which our Saviour had been subjected. Matthew indeed, says, after his fast of forty days, and his hunger had become extreme: "And when the tempter *came* to him." This does not imply that he had never come before. He might have approached him often. But now, in new circumstances, and much more than ever exposed to danger, a new onset from the adversary, as might be expected, was realized. Our conclusion, therefore, is, that, during the whole forty days, he was more or less of the time subject to those temptations which found their culminating points at the end of the time specified, or to other temptations not here mentioned.

3. The nature of the *fasting*. The fast of forty days may have been more or less rigid. Fasting implies sometimes partial, and sometimes total, abstinence. When Luke says, that "in those days he did eat nothing," he may mean that he had no regular supplies, that he subsisted only on the roots and wild fruits which he found in the desert. So Daniel says of himself, that he was "mourning three full weeks, that he ate no pleasant bread neither came flesh nor wine into his mouth." But whether this fast was more or less rigid, doubtless the Saviour suffered greatly from it; and, at the end of the time, the severest knowings of hunger come upon him.

4. The *scene* of the temptation. The scene of the temptation was the wilderness. What wilderness the Scripture refers to,

we have no means of determining. Probably it was one of those wild, uninhabited places which abounded near the Jordan. It is sufficient for our purpose, that the place was a desert, a solitude, howling with wild beasts, and so a fit place for dejection of mind, and the attacks of the adversary.

5. But how *came* Jesus into this place of temptation? Matthew says, that he was led up by the Spirit (*ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος*). Mark says, the Spirit driveth him (*τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει*); and Luke again, that he was led by the Spirit (*ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι*). What Spirit do the sacred writers mean? Certainly, the Holy Spirit. For the record says, that, being full of the Holy Ghost, or Holy Spirit (*Πνεύματος ἁγίου*), he was led by the Spirit (*Πνεύματος*), that is, the same Spirit with which he was filled. The words of Luke, *αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει*, the Spirit driveth him, mean nothing more than that he was borne away by the powerful urgency of the Spirit within him. The *Πνεῦμα* here is not the evil Spirit, for the word never refers in Scripture to the evil Spirit, unless when connected with some qualifying word to indicate it. Nor need we be stumbled at the idea that the Spirit of God should lead the Son of God into temptation. Christ came expressly to destroy the works of the devil. Under the tempter and arch enemy of man, the first Adam had fallen and ruined us all; the second Adam must contend with and overcome the same, or human recovery would be impossible. Christ, the captain of our salvation, must be made perfect through suffering, must be able to succor the tempted through experience of temptation, must bruise the serpent's head. It was, then, a part of God's plan, that his Son should come into conflict with the prince of evil, and get the mastery of him. He must, therefore, be exposed to his temptations, and to his temptations in the severest forms.

6. But how is it possible that a perfectly holy being should be tempted? The question is readily answered, when we understand the meaning of the word *πειράζω*, from which *πειρασθῆναι* and *πειραζόμενος* are derived, signifying *to make trial of, to try*. God tempted or tried Abraham; wicked men tempt or try God; they are also tempted or tried by their own lusts; in other words, men are placed under powerful inducements to do evil, as they sometimes place God under powerful inducements to punish them. Christ was led into the wilderness that he might feel the full influence of the most powerful inducements to do wrong,

and, as our example and Saviour, resist them, maintain his integrity and manifest his incorruptible virtue. It is, indeed, said, that God tempteth no man; that is, he never lays before men motives to evil that he may lead them into sin, while he *does* place them in circumstances of affliction, trial and inducement to wrong, that, by opportunities of overcoming evil, they may manifest their loyalty to him and be confirmed in it.

Now, with this idea of temptation, we have only to remember that our Saviour, though Divine, was perfectly human; that he had human feelings, appetites and susceptibilities, and we shall see that temptation is possible even to a sinless nature. Suppose a holy human being famishing with hunger; suppose that his sufferings are so great, as has sometimes been the case with starving persons, that he is ready to tear the flesh from his own body. Now place before him a table loaded with food. His desire for it is unavoidable and inexpressible. But God says, touch it not. Nature insists on snatching a loaf. But duty says, No. Here are the most imperious appetites, the most powerful inducements. But it is possible to conceive of a person who says, No; I'll suffer, I'll starve, I'll die, but I will not disobey God. The inclination to *eat* is almost irresistible, but there is not the *slightest disposition to disobey* God. Reason sits upon its throne and exercises its power of choice. The mind is made up at once, decidedly, unwaveringly, and once for all. The urgency of nature to eat is almost infinite. But the true man within the man says, No! He says it instantly, he says it cheerfully, without the least murmur or disposition to murmur. While it is almost naturally impossible to refrain, it is really morally impossible to eat, under the circumstances supposed. We may say, therefore, of our Saviour, that, as a man, in case of extreme hunger, he must desire food, and, as a free agent, power to gratify forbidden desires, but, as a holy being, who prefers death to evil, he cannot do this wickedness and sin against God. There are also mental as well as physical susceptibilities which belong to human nature as such. And it is conceivable that a person might have strong *natural* desires for some forbidden object or attainment, beyond and above the province of mere animal appetite, and that the indulgence or immediate denial of these desires should make the difference in a given instance between sin and holiness. If this be true, a holy being, independent of bodily organization, might be subjected to temptation.

7. By what *agency* was Jesus tempted? *ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου*, says Matthew; *ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ*, says Mark; *ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου*, says Luke. This is not the place to discuss the question of the existence of evil spirits. But a few words on the subject seem necessary. No man can deny that God has created other orders of rational beings besides men; or that some of those orders have fallen; or that a purely spiritual being can have influence over human minds. The New Testament teaches the existence of angels and devils. It teaches this almost as plainly as it teaches the existence of God. It would require nearly as much violence to language, if we should interpret the Scriptures so as to exclude from them the recognition of good and evil spirits, as it would to exclude the recognition of God. Man, in his original state, and in his true nature, before the apostasy, is never represented as originally evil; it comes to him first from without. There is an outward force which holds sway over humanity, and which must be destroyed. Man fell being tempted by the serpent, elsewhere called, that old serpent, the devil. The first prediction concerning the Messiah is, that he, the seed of the woman, should bruise the serpent's head. When Christ came, he recognized the existence of devils, and assumed to cast them out. He spoke of an individual as their leader, whom he called *the devil*, and the prince of this world; and of his associates, as the angels of the devil, as devils, and the powers of darkness.

This *individual*, a mighty, mysterious, fallen intelligence, not, however, omniscient nor omnipotent, the head of a great organized opposition to God, the arch foe of man and the prince of evil, is *the agent* by whom Jesus is tempted. Some, indeed, have supposed the occurrences under consideration to be a mere representation of a conflict on the part of Christ with impersonal evil. But there is hardly more reason for supposing that what is here called the devil is impersonal, than to suppose that what is here called Jesus is impersonal. The principle of interpretation which would remove the evil agent, as an agent, from the record, would remove our Saviour himself from the record, as an agent. The only thing which can be distorted, on exegetical grounds, into an argument for supposing that the temptation is anything other than a narrative of facts, is the use of the preposition *ἐν* by Luke before *τῷ Πνεύματι*, which might allow us to say that Jesus was led *in* the Spirit, instead of saying, as one translation does, that he was led by the Spirit. But that this

preposition often signifies *by*, no one acquainted with the New Testament Greek will deny. Matthew and Mark, moreover, use the preposition *ἐν* instead of *ἐν*, and *ἐν* never signifies *in*, but *under*, *through* and *by*, either of which definitions would require the sense given in our translation. Besides, the same passage which says that he was led up by (*ἐν*) the Spirit, says that he was tempted by (*ἐν*) the devil. If we should say he was led up *in* the Spirit, then, to be consistent, we must say that he was led up *in* the devil.

The whole of Farmer's argument (with the exception just considered), that the temptation is a vision, bases itself on mere aesthetic grounds, which a proper explanation of the passage removes. To the idea, then, that the narrative is a vision, myth, parable, representation, we have only to say that there is no evidence of it whatever. On exegetical grounds, we can no more explain away the reality of the temptation than we can explain away the reality of the Saviour's baptism, his agony in the garden, or even his crucifixion.

8. General explanation. As the *narrative*, taken literally, is supposed by some to involve absurdities and suppositions shocking to the feelings, and dishonorable to Christ,¹ we must now proceed to the explanation of it. The main objections to the most literal interpretation, then, are the bodily presence of the tempter, and the Saviour suffering himself to be thus taken from place to place by him, when he knew who this being was, and knew his object. But what reason is there for supposing a bodily presence? The prince of evil is a spirit; if he comes in his true nature, he comes as a spirit. Besides, Christ was tempted in all respects as we are, and we are not tempted by Satan in his bodily presence but by his evil suggestions. It does not appear that he ever presented himself in human form on any other occasion, why should he have departed from his custom, in the Saviour's case? Moreover, his hope of success must have depended upon his concealing his true character.

But, supposing only a spiritual presence, it is said the Saviour must have known, at once, both the tempter and his designs, and have refused all converse with him. But this proceeds on the

¹ Such as that Christ was led about from place to place by Satan in bodily form, followed Satan wherever the prince of evil was disposed to go with him, and, without resistance, was even carried through the air and placed on the top of the temple by him.

supposition that Jesus, as a man, knew all things, a sentiment which the Scripture expressly contradicts. He was once an infant and had only an intelligence. He grew in knowledge as he grew in stature; and in full maturity, he said of one event, of that day and that hour knoweth no man, not even the Son. That he was Divine as well as human, and that, when he called his Divine nature into exercise, he was omniscient by the power of it, no orthodox Christian will deny. But that he was also human, and that as such his faculties were subject to human limitations, every reader of the New Testament confesses. Speaking of him as Divine, no doubt God dwelt in him, and was one with him; but speaking of him as human, it is equally true that there were times when he confessed his weakness, and the imperfection of his knowledge. Is it necessary to suppose, that he enjoyed the full consciousness of his Deity and had all his Divine attributes in exercise, during a series of temptations by which God was fitting him to succor the tempted? We shall the more readily answer this question, if we consider what occurred towards the close of his ministry. During the crucifixion, he was bereft for a time of *all consciousness of God's presence*, and in this state of mind was subjected, there is reason to believe, anew to temptation. Luke says, at the close of the scene in the wilderness, that the devil departed from him *for a season*, plainly indicating that his attacks would be renewed at some future period. Christ said to his disciples, on the night of betrayal, the prince of this world cometh and has nothing in me. A few hours afterward, and after the agony in the garden, he says to the officers who came to arrest him, now is your hour and the power of darkness; and Paul, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, says, that, when he offered up prayers and supplications with strong cryings and tears, he was heard in that he feared. Putting these things together, it is manifest that our Saviour was subjected to a temptation at the *close* of his ministry, addressed to his fears, and, from the fact that he exclaimed, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me," we infer that during the struggle he was unsustained by any conscious presence of his Deity. The natural inference, therefore, is, that, in the temptations which took place at the commencement of his ministry, he acted only in his human nature, without the knowledge or the power which belonged to his Divine nature, and without other supports than those which a human being derives from God.

Now, then, calling to mind that he was tempted in all respects as we are, and so not by the bodily presence, but by the suggestions of the tempter, and keeping in view the other fact just stated, viz. the limitation of his knowledge when acting only as a man, we infer that as it is with us, so it must have been with him, viz. that the suggestions of the adversary, so long as they were *innocent*, could not be distinguished from his own innocent thoughts, and that the presence of the tempter could be known only by his temptations to evil. As we have seen before, there was time enough after the termination of the forty days, to have visited a high mountain or have returned to Jerusalem, before the entire conflict was ended. We suppose the temptation, then, to have occurred after this manner. At the end of forty days, the tempter, not corporially but mentally present, suggests the idea of turning stones into bread. This being contrary to one of our Saviour's fundamental principles of action, which was, never to use miraculous powers for his own relief, and implying distrust in God and the presumptuous taking of matters into his own hands, was immediately recognized as a temptation, and immediately repelled. The next attempt consists of two parts, going to Jerusalem, to the pinnacle of the temple, and the proposition to cast himself down. The first part, by itself considered, would be innocent, and the inducement to it might not be recognized as coming from the tempter. There might have been important reasons in the Saviour's mind, why he should go to Jerusalem and ascend to the top of the temple. And the presentation of those reasons, though *really* pressed upon him from without, may not have been distinguished from his own thoughts, and so have been innocently complied with. But when the idea of throwing himself down, to astonish and convince the multitude by such a daring feat, relying on the Scripture that the angels should bear him up, was suggested, the Saviour knew, in an instant, that this proposition, involving an unbidden act of the highest presumption, and the indulgence of unhallowed pride and vanity, was from the evil one, and he instantly repelled it. So in the last case, there could be no sin in ascending a mountain, whether in the desert, or having left the desert, somewhere near Jerusalem. The most cogent reasons of a good kind may have occurred to him, nor was there anything wrong in looking round on the kingdoms of the world. But the suggestion came to accept dominion of them at the hands of Satan. The blas-

phemous suggestion indicates the source from which it came, and is repelled with scorn, and an indignant "Get thee behind me, Satan."

Olshausen, whose commentary on this subject is generally able and judicious, supposes that the Saviour, instead of actually visiting Jerusalem and ascending the mountain, went through with this part of the transaction only in mind; that he went to Jerusalem and upon the pinnacle of the temple, and went up the mountain and saw the kingdoms, only in imagination. But if we admit the whole of this idea, we may about as well admit that the whole temptation took place only in imagination, or, as Farmer and others assert, that it was merely a vision, both which suppositions Olshausen himself rejects as untenable.

The only remaining difficulty which needs to be explained, is contained in the declaration, that Satan showed him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them in a moment of time. According to the free manner in which the word *all* is used in Scripture, we need not suppose that the Saviour had a view of *every* kingdom on earth, or even of the major part of the kingdoms. It is said that all Judea, and all Jerusalem, and all the country round about Jordan went to John's baptism. The meaning obviously is, that vast multitudes went, though perhaps not a fifth part of *all* the inhabitants. We understand, then, by the words under consideration, that the Saviour had an instantaneous view of the leading kingdoms of the earth. These may naturally have come before him as the vivid conceptions of a mind highly excited by the circumstances in which it was placed, and the influences which were upon it. The laws of Scripture language would be fulfilled, we think, by this supposition, though, as already shown, the idea of going to Jerusalem and up the mountain, only in mind, would require violence done to the text. For us to say that we went to Boston and to the top of the State-house, or that we went to the top of the White Mountains, would be to imply, if we gave no notice to the contrary, that we did these acts literally. But if we should say, that, standing alone on the top of a mountain, and pressed with most trying thoughts, we saw all the kingdoms of the world in a moment, we should expect people to understand that we saw them as vivid conceptions. We suppose, then, that the Saviour saw these kingdoms, as vivid mental conceptions, so vivid, perhaps, as to become almost momentary illusions, and that the

tempter made use of these conceptions, to accomplish his infernal purposes.

9. The adaptation of these temptations to their object. That they were real, and that they were powerful, there can be no question. Think of a starving man able to satisfy his hunger by an act, *wrong* indeed, but by an act which has an innocent appearance, and for which he might readily excuse himself under the circumstances. How strong the inducement! what a nice sense of right and wrong, what wonderful conscientiousness, what decided virtue, what noble self-denial, does resistance imply! Think, again, of the position of the Saviour in reference to his countrymen. He was a different character from what the Jews had expected in the Messiah; he was of humble origin, a stranger, with no splendid claims on their notice. He would have to encounter their prejudices; the chances were more than a hundred to one that he would be rejected. Now, standing on the pinnacle of the temple, and looking down along the deep precipice on the edge of which the temple stood, he appears, in the presence of the people, at the height of between three and four hundred feet above the ground. Cast thyself down headlong, no injury will follow, the Scriptures encourage the act, promising that the angels shall bear thee up; the multitudes thronging round the temple will witness the astounding feat, and hail thee with shoutings and raptures as Messiah and King. The choice is thus offered him between a magnificent reception by his countrymen and a life of glorious royalty on the one hand, or contempt and rejection on the other. If we cannot fully sympathize with the trials of this temptation, it is only because we cannot enter into the circumstances. We forget that Christ was completely human. In the last temptation, it was made apparent to the Saviour that he could become prince of the world on the same conditions, on which many of the greatest potentates had received their power, viz. by a disregard to what is right, by casting off allegiance to God; or, what is the same thing, by bowing down to Satan. Alexander, Caesar, Tamerlane, Napoleon, so far as men can judge, obtained supremacy in this way. Instigated by ambition, they fought their way to the heights of worldly power and fame. They acted for self-aggrandizement and not for the glory of God, under the influence and patronage of the prince of this world, the prince of the power of the air, which ever worketh in the children of disobedience. To a mind

which had the least innate corruption, the least worldly ambition, this would have been a powerful temptation, probably an irresistible one. The aspirant for fame would not need, perhaps, to recognize the supremacy of Satan, in so many words or in forms. Only let him cast off the fear of God, and learn to call evil good under the blinding influence of specious pretences, and he becomes, of course, a high subject of man's arch tempter. Such a temptation, though like the others it found nothing in Christ corresponding to it, no inward corruption on which its fires could kindle, was the most powerful temptation which that peerless spirit of darkness could invent.

10. The representative character of these temptations. They represent three great classes of temptations by which mankind are apt to be assailed. The first is addressed to the physical appetites. It is an appeal to the susceptibilities and infirmities of sense. He who could maintain his integrity, under such circumstances as those in which Jesus was placed, must be considered as a man of impregnable virtue as respects his whole animal nature. The second is addressed to a love of admiration and applause, which is natural to men. Nothing is sweeter to the mass of mankind than that incense of praise which follows great achievements. Here, in this third department of human abilities, was Jesus vigorously assailed. Coming off victorious, he shows himself forever incapable of seduction, by any possible offer, from this source. The third was addressed to a mental susceptibility, nearly, if not quite, universal among men, the love of power and possession. He who could resist the offer of all the kingdoms of the world and all the splendors attending supremacy over them, must be acknowledged superior to every possible allurements of wealth, glory and power. Nor can any temptation be conceived of, under which a person would be likely to fall, who had triumphantly overcome the three in question. In the victory thus obtained, man has a captain of salvation, a perfect example of moral heroism, in maintaining allegiance to the right.

11. The manner in which Christ resisted the devil commends itself to imitation. He did it instantly, decidedly, and by the word of God. He did not suffer himself to be deceived by the specious arguments of the adversary, not even by quotations from the Scriptures. But having a clear sense of right, and a firm will, answering Scripture, wrongly applied, by plain affirma-

tions of truth, he triumphed for himself and for mankind. As humanity fell with the first Adam, under the power of the tempter, so was the way prepared for it to rise again through the victories of the second Adam in the wilderness. Whoever believes in Christ, and would resolutely follow him, in a course of instantaneous, decided resistance to evil, might soon rise, through grace, to an almost superhuman dignity, in the scale of being.

12. The rewards of temptation vanquished. "Then the angels came and ministered unto him." Full of blissful thoughts, and encouraged by these beauteous spirits, Christ went forth to toil and suffering, having the peace of God within him and his glory round about him. Let men also resist evil, fleeing to Christ for succor in the hour of temptation, and angels, who still minister unto the heirs of salvation, will come to them, and the joy of Jesus will fill their hearts.

13. A single remark on the discrepancy in the order of these temptations, as recorded by the evangelists, will finish what we designed to say on the subject. According to Matthew, the second temptation is that whose scene of action is the pinnacle of the temple, while the third has reference to the kingdoms of the world. In Luke, the order is reversed. Matthew, by the use of the particle *τότε*, with which he introduces the fifth verse, and *πάλιν*, which stands at the beginning of the eighth, shows clearly that he intends to designate the exact order in which the several events occurred, while the general and free manner employed by the other evangelists shows with equal clearness, that he meant simply to present the facts without regard to the order of occurrences.

ARTICLE IX.

THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF MICHIGAN.¹

By James R. Boise, M. A., Professor in the University of Michigan.

MICHIGAN was admitted to the Union as a State in the year 1835. Since that period, its career has been rapid and brilliant in many respects. The increase of its population, the development of its agricultural and mineral wealth, and the decided steps which it has taken in many of the leading reforms of the day, give it a rank and position seldom attained in the brief period of eighteen years. Should an intelligent man from the heart of New England be suddenly and unconsciously transported to one of the towns of Michigan, though he might not at first be able to define his position, he would not, at all events, be conscious of any change of longitude. Pleasant mansions, cultivated gardens, an active and intelligent looking people, would still surround him. Such a civilization could not have grown up on the spot in so brief a period. It has been transplanted, and retains essentially the same characteristics with the more easterly region from which it came. But as the new land to be occupied was better than the old which had been left, it was natural that men of enterprise and experience should make attempts at improvements in some things. The system which our New England fathers adopted for extending the advantages of education to all classes of the people, has been long and justly praised; but, excellent as that system unquestionably is, the founders of the State of Michigan, in adopting its leading provisions, ventured

¹ Popular Education: for the use of Parents and Teachers, and for young persons of both sexes. Prepared and published in accordance with a resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Michigan. By Ira Mayhew, A. M., late Superintendent of Public Instruction. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1850.

System of Public Instruction and Primary School Law of Michigan. Prepared by Francis W. Shearman, Superintendent of Public Instruction. Lansing, Mich. 1852.

A Discourse delivered by Henry P. Tappan, D. D., at Ann Arbor, Mich., on the occasion of his Inauguration as Chancellor of the University of Michigan, December 21, 1852.

to introduce into it some changes which are claimed to be improvements. To examine some of these points, with a view to determine whether any improvements of this kind have already been made, or, more especially, can still be made, is our present object.

Before, however, proceeding to this examination, it may be well to refer, for a moment, to the publications named at the head of our Article. These may be considered the offspring, as well as the representatives, of the educational movement in Michigan; and from them we draw a considerable portion of our information on this subject.

The work of Mr. Superintendent Mayhew contains a series of well-written essays on a variety of topics relating to practical and general education. It is a book for the people, and cannot fail to exert a healthful and elevating influence. That feature of it which appears to us the most striking of all, is the decidedly religious tone which everywhere pervades it. The following paragraph is of so much importance in itself, and presents, also, so clearly the general character and scope of the whole work, that we cannot refrain from giving it entire.

"In the next place, the idea that man is a being destined to an immortal existence, is almost, if not altogether, overlooked. Volumes have been written on the best methods of training men for the profession of a soldier, of a naval officer, of a merchant, of a physician, of a lawyer, of a clergyman, and of a statesman; but I know of no treatise on this subject, which, in connection with other subordinate aims, has for its grand object, to develop that train of instruction which is most appropriate for man, considered as a candidate for immortality. This is the more unaccountable, since, in the works alluded to, the eternal destiny of human beings is not called in question, and is sometimes referred to as a general position which cannot be denied; yet the means of instruction requisite to guide them in safety to their final destination, and to prepare them for the employments of their everlasting abode, are either overlooked, or referred to in general terms, as if they were unworthy of particular consideration. To admit the doctrine of the immortality of the human soul, and yet to leave out the consideration of it, in a system of mental instruction, is both impious and preposterous, and inconsistent with the principle on which we generally act in other cases, which requires that affairs of the greatest moment should occupy our chief attention. If man is only a transitory inhabitant of this lower world; if he is journeying to another and more important scene of action and enjoyment; if his abode in this higher scene is to be permanent and eternal; and if the course of instruction through which he now passes has an important bearing on his happiness in that state, and his preparation for its enjoyments — if all this be true, then surely every system of education must be glaringly defective, which either overlooks or throws into the shade the immortal destination of human beings."

Would that all practical educators, and all works on education, at least recognized the same just and rational views! Certainly it seems too plain to admit of controversy, that all theories of education which do not take into account our future and infinitely more extended life, must be radically defective. It is for this reason that we deem a discussion of the interests of education always in place in a theological Review. It is only because we hold to this theory of education, that we believe its universal diffusion to be the great hope of our country, the main support of a free government; and we are the more rejoiced to see such principles asserted by men occupying high positions in society, now that these very principles are in many places called in question or directly assailed. Far distant be the day when the religious element in our common-school education shall be excluded on the false charge of sectarianism. We do not, indeed, advocate the teaching of dogmatic theology in primary schools; although we should not consider even this so dangerous as difficult. We are not aware that this is anywhere, even now, attempted. But if the constant recognition and acknowledgment of the principles of Christianity is sectarianism, we must plead guilty to the charge of loving and fostering this evil; and we verily believe that, when this kind of sectarianism entirely ceases in our common schools, then will their peculiar value, as a means of perpetuating our free institutions, be at an end; or, as a Jewish historian would be likely to speak of such an event, then will the Lord God withdraw his favor from us.

The second treatise mentioned at the head of this Article, is a history of the origin and progress of public instruction in the State of Michigan, and contains a digest of all the laws and documents relating to this subject. It is lucid, systematic and thorough. Without any attempt at "fine writing," it furnishes what every sensible man values far more highly, distinct and reliable information, in a direct, perspicuous and vigorous style. To those who seek information on the subject of which it treats, it leaves nothing to be desired.

The inaugural address of President Tappan presents substantially the opinions which are contained in his more extended work on University Education. The greater condensation, however, which was necessary in a single address, has given to his views a sharper outline, and if possible, greater distinctness, while the consciousness of his new and responsible position

infused a new grace into his style and fresh inspiration into his thoughts.

In reviewing the brief history of education in Michigan, we have been struck with the remarkable unity of plan and of action, which has, on the whole, all things considered, thus far characterized the proceedings of the State. Notwithstanding the discordant elements which have now and then been developed, arising in part, no doubt, from the jarring interests and the rivalry of different religious sects, and in part from the animosities of political parties, we challenge any other State to present the same spectacle of resolute determination to crush every attempt at disunion, and of triumph in placing the interests of education on a sure basis, high above the raging waves of political and religious faction. The annual reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and of the Regents of the University, as well as the frequent debates, in the State Legislature, on the subject of education, all tend to strengthen one's confidence in the determination of the people of the State not to commit so sacred a charge to unscrupulous men, and not to allow the symmetry of a beautiful and well-devised plan to be broken or marred. Although too little time has as yet elapsed to see the mature fruits of this unity of plan and action, it requires no peculiar prophetic power to predict the most beneficial results. The State of Michigan contains nearly as many square miles as the whole of New England, with a soil far more productive, and with almost unequalled mineral wealth. It will not be very long before the population of Michigan, at the present rate of increase, will be nearly equal to that of New England. Let us now suppose that the whole of New England were united in one State, and that all of its educational interests were subjected to one judicious system, at the head of which stood one university. Let us suppose that all of the wealth invested in college edifices and grounds, in libraries, in cabinets, and in museums, were united, and that all of the students and professors of New England colleges and universities were brought together, so as to constitute a single well-organized whole, is it not apparent that, for every person who is seeking an education, the advantages of such a university would far surpass those of any college or university now existing in this country? Would it not rival the best universities of the old world? It is perfectly clear that what we most need in this country for the perfection of the

highest institutions of learning, is, not so much the invention of new theories of education, nor the lapse of centuries to secure the growth of our so-called *infant* institutions, as well-concerted and united action. The first university in the world is not half so old as many of our *infant* institutions. While the University of Berlin, which was founded in 1810, attained at once the stature and strength and wisdom of manhood, many of the New England colleges of equal or greater age, are not yet far removed from *infancy*! The causes of these phenomena are too apparent to require comment. While, therefore, the wisest practical educators of New England unceasingly regret the existence among them of so many small colleges, instead of a few larger institutions of learning, and are aiming, in the best way they can, to remedy this evil, the people of Michigan have no such obstacles to overcome, no old system to pull down, upon the ruins of which they are to construct a new and better; they have already—to the praise of their firmness be it said—a system which, whatever other defects it may exhibit, possesses at least the merit of consistent unity.

Another point worthy of particular notice, is, the provision which the State has made, or is making, for the gratuitous instruction of its sons in all departments of study, from the most elementary schools to the highest professional education. The tuition is free even in the University. So far as our knowledge extends, no other State in the Union, and no other country, has yet taken this important step. While New England has long boasted of her superiority over every country of the old world, in the provisions which she has made for the education of children, Michigan may, with not less pride, boast that she alone has perfected the plan, in offering gratuitous education, not only to children and youth, but also to persons of maturer years, whether they may wish to prepare for any of the learned professions, or to push their investigations in science and philosophy beyond the usual routine of study. It is as unnecessary to enlarge upon the advantages of this generous provision, as it is impossible to anticipate the full benefit which may ultimately result from it.

But that which has chiefly arrested our attention, in reading the history of education in Michigan, is the striking announcement that the system which has been adopted, was framed in imitation of that which prevails in Prussia. Leaping beyond

the older New England States, and passing by the imperfect school-systems of England and France, the first settlers of this new State looked for a model, not, indeed, as an object of servile imitation, but as affording the best outlines to a system which is now generally acknowledged to be the most symmetrical and perfect in existence. While Michigan was yet a territory, important steps had been taken by Congress to provide for the cause of education by setting apart ample tracts of land, the avails of which should constitute a permanent fund to be devoted exclusively to this object. On the first organization of a State government, although many features of the present system of public instruction had been marked out by the Legislature, the responsible task of arranging the details of this system was committed to the first "Superintendent of Public Instruction," the Rev. J. D. Pierce, a man of liberal education, of enlightened policy and of comprehensive views.¹ Respecting this system, Mr. Superintendent Shearman remarks :

"The system of Public Instruction which was intended to be established by the framers of the Constitution, the conception of the office, of its province, its powers and duties, were derived from Prussia. That system consisted of three degrees. Primary instruction, corresponding to our district schools; secondary instruction, communicated in schools called Gymnasias; and the highest instruction, communicated in the Universities. The superintendence of this entire system, which was formed in 1819, was intrusted to a minister of State, called the Minister of Public Instruction, and embraced everything which belonged to the moral and intellectual advancement of the people."²

Again, in the inaugural address of President Tappan, the idea is presented in a strong light, that Michigan, in its system of education, has adopted for a model the system of Prussia. As this subject is one of much importance, and must be one of general interest, it may not be unprofitable to compare, as well as we can, the model with the copy, more especially to discover whether any improvements may be made in the latter.

In the first place, let us inquire what is the Prussian system of education? The main classification of Primary Schools, Gymnasias and Universities, has above been given. Of the primary schools, we need not speak particularly. Our impression is, that they are every way inferior to the same grade of schools in this country. Not only is there far less attention paid to ren-

¹ Mr. Pierce is a graduate of Brown University of the class of 1822.

² Public Instruction and School Law, p. 18.

der them comfortable and decent, but the range of studies is narrower, and the acquisitions of the pupils are more limited. One important feature in the organization of the primary schools of Prussia distinguishes them from the corresponding schools of this country; though established by law, the State does not provide gratuitous instruction in them. Every parent is compelled to send his children to school, but he is also compelled to pay for the instruction of every child. This system may appear to a Prussian far more equitable than ours, but it would probably be difficult to persuade any American that it would be wise to adopt it in this country. An important feature in the instruction itself, imparted in the common schools of Prussia, deserves also to be noticed. The principal dogmas of the established church are taught to every child, and thus an intimate connection is kept up between the school and the church, arising primarily from the acknowledged connection of the Church and the State. It is scarcely necessary to say, that nothing of this kind yet exists in Michigan.

It will be worth our while to consider the intermediate schools, or Gymnasias, somewhat more particularly; and, in the first place, we may mention the important fact, that they are intended exclusively for boys. The higher education of females is by no means encouraged to the same degree in Germany as in this country. Our own impression is, that anything like a thorough education among ladies, is decidedly unpopular; and the few German women, who so far cast aside the restraints of their sex, as to venture upon higher studies or upon authorships, are commonly dignified with the not very pleasing epithet of *blaue Strumpfe* (*blue stockings*).

Thus far, whatever differences have been pointed out between the Prussian and Michigan systems of education, have been, according to our standard of judgment, in favor of the latter. At this point, our self-adulation must terminate; and we shall often be compelled, if we exercise common candor, to acknowledge that much remains for us to do before we approach very near to the standard which we have set up. It is certainly not unprofitable to view simultaneously our own imperfections and the way in which they are avoided by others.

To gain some definite idea of a Prussian Gymnasium, we need to consider at what age a boy is usually admitted to it, how long he remains, and what are the studies pursued therein;

also to know something of the number and qualifications of the teachers usually employed. Of the six Gymnasia in Berlin, we may select the Friedrich Werdersche as a fair example of the Prussian Gymnasia generally. Before us lies a "Programm" of the public examination which was held in the hall (Hörsaal) of this Gymnasium in April, 1851. Such a "Programm" answers in some respects to the catalogue of an American college. From this publication, we abstract the following items of information. The number of pupils in the first Semester of the current year was 445; in the second Semester, 469. These were divided into eight classes or years; for, to pass from one class to the next higher, a year's study, at least, is ordinarily required. In the year 1851, only fifteen went from this Gymnasium to the University. Of this fifteen, thirteen had spent two years, instead of one, in the highest class (Prima), and two had spent *two years and a half* in the same class. This would make nine years or nine and a half for the entire course. The average of the ages of these fifteen, of whom the oldest was twenty and the youngest fifteen, was eighteen years. This may be accepted in general as a fair average of the different ages of students on entering the German universities. If, therefore, we allow eight years for the Gymnasium, the usual age for commencing the studies of the Gymnasium would consequently be ten. But another question, and one equally important with the length of time spent at the Gymnasium, is, what are the studies pursued during these eight years, from the age of ten to eighteen? The principal studies are Latin, Greek, German, French, Mathematics, History, and the Natural Sciences; and the relative amount of time given to these studies respectively is represented as follows: Latin, *nine and a fourth*; Greek, *four and a fourth*; German, *two and a half*; French, *two and five-eighths*; Mathematics, *three and seven-eighths*; History and Geography, *three and five-eighths*; the Natural Sciences, *one and a fourth*. The study of Latin is commenced at the beginning of the course and continued through to the end of it, in at least nine lessons each week, and through two years (the Ober and Unter Secunda), in ten lessons weekly. Greek is commenced on the third year from the beginning (in the class called Quarta), and is continued through the remaining six years, in four weekly lessons the first year of the study, and subsequently in six weekly lessons. Thus it appears that the prominence given to the study of Greek, and especially of Latin,

constitutes the chief peculiarity in this course of study. The number of teachers employed in the Friedrich Werdersche Gymnasium in the year 1851, was twenty-six. This would render the work of the individual teachers comparatively light, and would admit of a sufficiently extended division of labor. These teachers are all thoroughly educated men, the most of them being Doctors of Philosophy, and many of them being well known as authors.

We have thus endeavored to present, in a somewhat statistical form, an idea of a German Gymnasium; and now the question arises, what have we in this country corresponding to it? What is there now existing in the State of Michigan, which, with a change of names, would be above described? We think it would be exceedingly difficult to find anything. Do the Union Schools or the Academies answer to the above description? The Union Schools correspond to the so-called High Schools of New England; and the Academies do not differ materially from the Academies of other States. Now, setting aside the limited number of teachers in these American schools, and saying nothing of their qualifications to teach when compared with the Professors in the German Gymnasias, what degree of correspondence is found in the course of study? After somewhat extended observation, we have come to the conclusion, that two years may be considered the average length of time devoted by American students to a preparation for the college or the university. Many persons have been admitted to the best colleges and universities of our country after a much less period of preparatory study. In general, the amount of knowledge which would be required on entering the Unter Tertia of a Prussian Gymnasium (that is, the fourth year from the beginning), would gain admission to any American college or university; in other words, the first three years of the Gymnasium, *omitting the last five*, would be fully equivalent to an ordinary preparation for an American college! We forbear to institute further comparisons between things which have so little in common as a German Gymnasium and an American Academy.

It will not be supposed that we are ignorant of the existence of some honorable exceptions to the general character of American schools preparatory to the university. That the exception in this case should soon take the place of the rule, is our most ardent desire. It should, also, be mentioned in this connection,

that the far-sighted men who first framed the educational system of Michigan, and who looked to Prussia for a model, contemplated the establishment of preparatory schools, which they denominated "Branches of the University," which, in their main features, should come nearer to the German Gymnasium than anything now existing in this country. This plan, the very thought of which animates us with the most pleasing hope, was once partially commenced, but was abandoned in a time of financial embarrassment, and the execution of it has never yet been resumed. It has not, however, been lost sight of; for we find, in the report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the year 1851, the following decided language:

"No misfortune has ever occurred to this Institution (the University) equal in extent to that which has grown out of that system of policy, which has permitted or rendered necessary, perhaps, the abandonment of branches; and it would seem to be of the first importance, if the means of the Institution will permit the outlay of a large amount of capital for any purpose, that it should be directed into this channel. It is the settled judgment of this department, that so soon at least as the debt is extinguished, further effort and renewed exertion should be made, that the University 'may represent itself in the different sections of the State through its branches.' Reasons are multiplied, indicating this policy as the only means of filling up the Institution, and guarding against the multiplication of sectarian colleges."

Whether it would be advisable for the State of Michigan, under present circumstances, to attempt the establishment of branches of the University, or to aim at the elevation of the Union Schools and Academies, so as to fill the vacant space, we do not pretend to decide; but it is perfectly clear that something of this kind must sooner or later be done, before the educational system of the State can attain anything like the completeness which is desirable; nor do we deem this deficiency by any means a peculiarity of Michigan, but a weak point which belongs to her in common with all of the other States of the Union. To Michigan almost alone belongs the credit of discovering the deficiency, and of aiming to remedy it.

It remains for us now to compare the Prussian and the Michigan idea of a University. But to gain a correct conception of the former is by no means easy; for, although we have in this country frequent and apparently full descriptions of the German Universities, nothing is more difficult for an American than to form a just notion of them, without entering a German Univer-

sity, and becoming for a time a part of it; thus seeing it in full and perfect operation. A University in Germany contains four Faculties, one of Medicine, one of Law, one of Theology, and one of Philosophy. The Faculty of an American college corresponds very nearly to the Faculty of Philosophy in a German University. Have we not, then, in such an organization as Yale College or Cambridge University, where these four Faculties exist, a true representation of a German University? At first sight it appears that we have; but, setting aside the superior collateral advantages of a German University over anything which exists in this country — the incomparably superior libraries, the works of art, the cabinets for the illustration of natural science, and the far more numerous corps of professors — there remains still one important feature which distinguishes the two. The Faculty of Philosophy in an American university gives instruction to students who are, for the most part, looking forward to one of the learned professions, and who subsequently come under the instruction of one of the other Faculties. In a German university, this is seldom the case, but the Faculty of Philosophy has students of the same attainments with the other Faculties, who are pursuing the study of philosophy as a profession, and not as a preparation for their profession. The method of imparting instruction, also, by the Faculty of Philosophy, differs in this country from that of the other Faculties. It is either exclusively, or in a great measure, by question and answer, as in the German Gymnasium. Not so in the German universities; in the department of Philosophy, under which head are included Philology, History, Mathematics, and the general principles of the Natural Sciences, the instruction is given chiefly by lectures, as in the professional schools of this country. It is for these reasons, perhaps, that the colleges of this country are said to resemble the German Gymnasias rather than any department in the German Universities. In accordance with this view, President Tappan, in his inaugural address, remarks :

“In the Literary and Scientific Departments of the University of Michigan, we find ourselves at the present moment in just this condition; we are a University Faculty giving instruction in a College or Gymnasium.”

“Now our first object will be to perfect this Gymnasium. To this end, we propose to establish a scientific course parallel to the classical course.” * * *

So far as the method of imparting instruction is concerned,

the resemblance here affirmed holds good; the Literary and Scientific department of the University is a Gymnasium. But there are some very important points of difference between anything which has ever yet been called a Gymnasium and the collegiate department of the Michigan University. In the first place, the age at which students enter the latter, is not far from eighteen on an average, being the age at which students commonly enter the University in Germany; while we have above shown, that pupils who enter the first class (*Sexta*) of the Gymnasium, are not commonly over ten years of age. In the second place, the course of study in an American college, occupies only *four years* instead of *eight*, the period of study in a Gymnasium. But a third point of difference between the two, if not less important than those already specified, is the different character of the studies pursued. The course of study in the Literary and Scientific department of the Michigan University is substantially the same as in American colleges generally. The study of Latin is continued through the whole of the first year, through two terms of the second year, and through one term of the third year in five lessons each week. Thus we have an equivalent of two whole years with five weekly lessons. The same amount of time is given to the study of Greek and of the Modern Languages respectively. This is considerably less time than is devoted to the study of the Ancient Languages in Yale College and in Cambridge University, but does not fall greatly short of the time devoted to this study in most other American colleges. We have, then, two years with five weekly lessons, set over against eight years with nine weekly lessons for six years, and ten, for two years. This presents the ratio of *one to seven and two fifths*! In the Michigan University, the time devoted to the study of Latin, compared with the time devoted to the study of the Mathematics and Natural Sciences is as two and a third to three and two-fifths. In the Gymnasium to which we have referred, the Latin stands to the Mathematics and Natural Sciences in the ratio of nine and a fourth to five and an eighth! We do not think, therefore, all things considered, that the resemblance between the collegiate department of the Michigan University and a Prussian Gymnasium is particularly striking; and, although it is not our object to question the expediency of establishing a parallel course in which greater prominence shall be given to the Mathematics and Natural Sciences, and in which

the time devoted to the Ancient Languages shall be reduced to nothing, we are quite unable to discover how such a change will increase the resemblance to a Gymnasium.¹

Two lines may, indeed, be parallel, which are very wide apart; but if we recollect rightly the definitions of geometry, two lines cannot be parallel when the distances between them are continually varying. We do not, therefore, think there is much parallelism between a German Gymnasium and an American college or an American academy. Whatever points of resemblance there may be, the points of disagreement are so numerous that we are not disposed to carry on the comparison any further.

Only one professional school, that of Medicine, has yet been established in the Michigan University. In order to complete the mere outline of a University, a Law School must be added to the departments now existing; nor should we deem it altogether incompatible with the idea of a State Institution, that a Theological School should also be established as a part of the same organization. When this has been done, and when the philosophical department has been raised to the same level with the other departments, by greatly increasing the present requirements for admission to it, something will be presented before the public, having at least the external form of a Prussian University.

It would be easy to dwell upon other and important features in the organization of the German Universities, essentially differing from anything which exists on this side of the Atlantic; as, for example, the dependence of the professors' income on their success as instructors, and the additional incentive to exertion thus afforded; also, the careful and thorough investigation which marks every step in the progress of the German student, contrasted with the absurd practice of crowding almost every study into the short period of four years, thus rendering the attainment of thorough and finished scholarship in any one thing, from the very nature of the case, utterly impossible. We need

¹ Should the word *Gymnasia* be understood to include the *Realschulen*, our criticism would be unfounded; but the Germans, for the most part, make a wide distinction between the two. See *Conversations-Lexicon*, under the word *Realschulen*. An instructive article, reviewing all of the most recent German works on the *Gymnasia*, may also be found in the *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pædagogik* for May 13 and June 13, 1853. It is entitled: *Kleinere auf Gymnasialpædagogik bezügliche Schriften*.

not, however, again repeat what has been so often and so justly said on these subjects.

The views which have been above presented, suggest one topic, which, sooner or later, will require more attention than it has hitherto received in this country. We have the astonishing fact, that in Prussia more than twice as much time is devoted to the study of the ancient languages as we commonly devote to the same study in this country. This statement is very moderate; for, if we consider simply the Gymnasium, disregarding entirely the considerable time devoted by students in philosophy and theology to the study of Latin and Greek *while in the University*, we have eight years for Latin and six years for Greek, with an average of thirteen and a half lessons each week for six years, and nine and one fourth, for the remaining two years. Now allowing two years for Latin and one for Greek, with five weekly lessons in each before entering college in this country, and two years with five weekly lessons for each language after admission to college, we have in all, four years for Latin and three for Greek. Four added to three would be seven; this multiplied by five, the number of weekly lessons, makes thirty-five. But eight, the number of years devoted to Latin in the Gymnasium, added to six, the number devoted to Greek, makes fourteen; this multiplied by seven and five-sevenths, the average number of weekly lessons in the Ancient Languages during these fourteen years, makes one hundred and eight. The ratio thus presented is thirty-five to one hundred and eight! Certainly we are guilty of no exaggeration when we say, that in this country, we devote less than half as much time to Latin and Greek as they devote to the same study in Prussia.¹ Add to this fact, the superior qualifications of the Prussian Professors to the teachers in our academies, not to say our colleges, and the disparity becomes still greater.

Now allowing the Prussian system of education to be the best

¹ The *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik*, May 31, 1853, contains a sensible article throwing much light on the practical workings of the German Gymnasias. It is entitled: *Die sogenannten Silentien an den Gymnasien*. The writer of this article speaks of *nine years*, instead of *eight*, as being the prescribed period of study preparatory to the university; and adds, that a considerable number devote even more than this amount of time before their preparation is deemed complete; a fact which we have above noticed, in speaking of the Friedrich Werdersche Gymnasium.

at present existing (and we have never fallen in with an intelligent man who disputed this fact), what practical inference may we draw? If the capacities of American and Prussian youth are assumed to be in general equal, which we take to be a safe assumption, and if the Prussian system of education does not allow too large a space to the Ancient Languages, it follows that our system of education allows less than half enough time to this study.

Is not this fact alone sufficient to account for the low estimation in which the Ancient Languages are generally held in this country? How can any study be appreciated when it is not understood? and how can it be liked when nothing more is known of it than that it is difficult? But, says an objector, do I need to eat a whole orange in order to determine its flavor? We remember once to have tasted of an orange half grown. We did not relish it particularly well; and had we never tasted the ripe fruit, we could not have imagined that such a concentration of sourness and bitterness would ever acquire the most delicious sweetness. It has been said, by one of our most popular educators: "If, by placing Latin and Greek upon their own merits, they are unable to retain their present place in the education of civilized and Christianized man, then let them give place to something better." Whatever may have been intended by this remark, we are ready to endorse its true meaning. It is quite plain that we must soon come to this point, either to abandon the study of Latin and Greek altogether in a general education, and to substitute something better (if we can find it), or else to give them a fair chance and thus place them upon their own merits. This latter has been done in Prussia, and they seem able to retain their present place among civilized and Christianized Prussians; it has never yet, properly speaking, been done in this country, but we should be glad to see the experiment fairly made, and we have some faint hope that they would be able to retain their place among "civilized and Christianized" Americans.

The question then arises, if it be desirable or necessary to increase the length of time devoted to the study of the Ancient Classics, how can it be done? Can sufficient time be spared from the present collegiate course, to accomplish the desired object? We should say, most emphatically, it is for many reasons impossible. There is but one way in which the end can

be attained. These studies must be prosecuted much further than is now done, before students are admitted to college. There is certainly ample time for this. The average age of students in this country on entering college is about the same as of students who enter the university in Germany, and who have, consequently, completed the course of study in the Gymnasium. Youth is manifestly the period when languages are most easily acquired. There is no good reason, that we know of, why the youth of our country should not be as good linguists at eighteen as the youth of Germany. But, to bring about so desirable a reform, two things are necessary; first, that the requirements for admission to college be raised by all of those colleges which can afford to lose a few students without endangering their existence; and, secondly, that a strenuous effort be made to elevate the character of the intermediate schools. The want of these in sufficient number, and of sufficiently elevated character, is the chief deficiency in the educational system not only of Michigan, but of the entire country. Without them, it is vain to think of building up great universities. We may have great college edifices, and collect a great number of students in them, but neither the one, nor the other, nor both together, would make a great university, in any just sense. The culture, the education, would still be wanting.

We dismiss this subject by simply alluding to one thing: the prevailing fear that the cause of science would suffer, if more time should be given to the study of the languages. The slightest knowledge of the condition of science in Prussia, is sufficient to dissipate this fear entirely. We need not, had we space for it, enumerate here the names of those Prussians who have distinguished themselves in science, and who have first passed through the classical training of the Gymnasia. The main facts and principles of the physical sciences are, indeed, communicated in the Gymnasia; and this, as experience has shown, can successfully be done without interfering with the study of language; but no time is gained by setting a very young person at work in the higher mathematics, or the more abstruse principles of science. We consider this fact abundantly proved by the workings of that system of education, which, we rejoice to say, the State of Michigan has adopted for a model.

ARTICLE X.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

I. DR. HICKOK'S MORAL SCIENCE.¹

AFTER an Introduction and four Preliminary Chapters, this interesting work divides itself into two Parts. The First Part is devoted to what its author terms "Pure Morality;" under which are included duties to ourselves, to our fellow men, to nature, and to God. The Second Part is devoted to "Positive Authority;" under which are included civil government, Divine government, family government. Dr. Hickok's classifications are often exact and neat (see, for example, pp. 63, 64, 68, 69, of his Treatise), and under the various divisions of the present volume he has introduced many wise and rich suggestions. His Treatise is a book of *principles*, and is less minute than some other Ethical Works in explaining the *details* of morality. In certain respects, this is an excellence; for when the volume is used as a text-book in colleges, it will awaken the attention and enthusiasm of both teacher and hearer. A very suggestive, is better than a very plain, text-book. Still, the application of ethical principles to particular cases is sometimes a process of much difficulty, and is often so useful for the clear elucidation of the principles themselves, that an ethical treatise often gains both interest and importance by a thorough discussion of some nice questions of casuistry.

One of the main impressions which Dr. Hickok's Treatise leaves on the mind is, that Right is supreme; that Duty is an end in and of itself; that Virtue possesses an intrinsic dignity and grandeur. The very *style* of the volume is moulded by this idea. We often find such phrases as: "*it behooves* the Divine Lawgiver, by positive enactments to institute," etc., "God's administration *should* especially guard those susceptibilities which most endanger piety," etc.

This valuable Treatise of Dr. Hickok exhibits, and tends to cultivate a true manliness of spirit, a sense of personal honor, an abhorrence of pusillanimity. The author is independent in his reasonings as well as in his style. He has his own system and he defends it in a kind manner, but with an honorable self-reliance. He exhibits no mawkish sentimentalism, but encourages the bold as well as the gentle, the active as well as the passive virtues. Our meaning will be readily apprehended, if his remarks on the duty of self-defence, on pp. 74—76, be compared with Dymond's instructions on the same theme.

¹ A System of Moral Science. By Laurens P. Hickok, D. D., Union College. Schenectady: Published by G. Y. Van Deogert; London: John Chapman. 1853. pp. 431. 8vo.

In discussing the principles of Ethics, Dr. Hickok alludes occasionally to certain theological dogmas. In fact he must do so, for the science of morals is inseparable from that of divinity. In these allusions, he often uses words with rare precision. Thus he speaks of the atonement of Christ, not as penalty, but as a *substitute* for "penalty," "an equivalent substitution for penalty." His views are explained in the following succinct paragraphs, which deserve to be pondered by the scientific theologian :

"As penalty itself cannot be endured, and grace prevail; and as penalty cannot be discarded, and leave the Divine authority without any sanction, some other sanction must come into its place. The sinner is to be freed from penalty; no other being can bear it for him, inasmuch as the very essence of penalty is Divine displeasure against the sinner punished, and no suffering by another than the sinner can have this ingredient of Divine displeasure; therefore something not punishment, but which, other than it, is yet to take the place of it, some substitute for it is yet to be provided." p. 348.

Many theologians are fond of teaching, more or less explicitly, that the Deity exercises justice as directly, as exactly, as definitely in the atonement, as in the punishment of the lost. Dr. Hickok teaches :

"But morality forbids that the substitution for penalty, and the provisions for reclaiming to loyalty, should subvert equity and justice. No means for reclaiming to piety may conflict with immutable morality and righteousness. With these claims of morality the administration of justice fully accorded, and thus no gracious provisions can subvert the old administration. Its principles are forever ethically sound and valid, and its subversion is an ethical impossibility. The Divine government may change its process from justice to grace, but may never deny its valid authority in either. The sovereign may change his throne and sceptre, but in taking the throne and sceptre of grace, he does not demolish, but only for the occasion leaves unoccupied, those of justice. The old administration is not subverted, the new is only on occasion substituted for it. All antinomian conclusions are wholly precluded, by the true apprehension of the equivalent substitution in grace." pp. 365, 366.

The qualities of a writer on ethics, as well as on theology, may be best learned from his definitions. Dr. Hickok thus defines several words, from the ambiguous use of which in many authors much confusion results :

"A moral *law* is a rule imposed upon a man; a moral *maxim* is a rule adopted by a man." p. 70.

"All action under the constraint of the ultimate Rule is *duty*; and all action against duty is *transgression*. A transgression may be from physical weakness, and we thus term it the man's *infirmity*. It may be through the man's carelessness, and we call it his *fault*. It may be deliberate and determined, and we then call it his *vice*. [Query. Is not vice distinguished from crime, by its denoting a less atrocious offence, and also, sometimes, by its denoting a *habit* of doing wrong?] There will be seen occasion hereafter for the distinction of vice as against a purely moral rule, and transgression of civil law which is *crime*, and

also transgression of God's law which is *sin*. To the personal author of the transgression we *impute* the intention, and term this his *guilt*; and when we refer to the retribution with which guilt is to be visited, we term the person to whom the guilt is imputed, *responsible*." p. 154.

"This self-knowledge of the spirit, or the consciousness of its own spiritual excellency, awakening in man's rational nature an imperative towards that which is due to his own intrinsic dignity, and which moves in complacency for obedience and in remorse for disobedience, is *conscience*. The capacity, [?] from this imperative of conscience to resist the impulses of appetite, and thus to possess an inherent spring to an alternative when the animal good allures, is *moral agency*. This causality of reason to act even against the cravings of appetite, and thus from the law of its own worthiness as ultimate end, is *will*: and which wholly differs from animal will (*brutum arbitrium*), that can only go out in executive acts after strongest appetite or highest happiness. When the will keeps in subjection every colliding appetite, and is thus regnant over the whole animal nature, it is *free-will*: when it yields to the animal impulse, so as to make the gratification of appetite, or highest happiness, its ultimate end, and thus puts the whole executive agency under the domination of sense, it is an *enslaved will*. When this capacity of will goes out towards either alternative of happiness or of worthiness as ultimate end, it is *choice*. When this choice of ultimate end is in reference to the highest generalization of all human action, and thus the whole voluntary capacity is disposed either towards the end of the sense or the end of the spirit, i. e. happiness or worthiness, Mammon or God, it is the *moral disposition*, giving permanent moral character. This differs wholly from constitutional bias, sometimes called natural disposition, and which results from physical temperament only; having no moral character in itself, except only in its constraint and subjection. When this agency, fixing upon its object as end, is contemplated solely as a subjective state, and not as going forth into overt action, it is *preference*; and when this has respect to objects beyond our reach, it is *wish*." pp. 58, 59.

Notwithstanding the scholastic air of Dr. Hickok's writings, there is a decided imaginative element obvious in them. On almost every page, the reader's interest is heightened by some original metaphor. It may be, that the figurative language is occasionally too bold for the severity of a didactic treatise. Thus we read:

"In mathematics the ultimate right is the *rectilinear*; and figuratively it may be said to make a demand in two particulars — one as opposed to a curve, and thus demanding that its production shall go from one point direct to another; the other as opposed to obliquity, and thus demanding perfect equality of spaces on each side.

"And now the rectilinear may be said to be analogous to the ultimate right in morals, inasmuch as that demands the end of the rational spirit to be *directly* attained; and also in the second case analogous, inasmuch as the right in morals demands perfect *equity* in dividing between the rights of opposing persons. The rectilinear as opposed to curvature is an analogon of worthiness as opposed to happiness; as opposed to obliquity, it is an analogon of equity as opposed to partiality." pp. 57, 58.

"As if another and a divine self, scanned and judged every purpose and thought of the acting self, so is every man when arraigned before his own personality, and made to hear with uncovered head his sentence of self-justification or self-condemnation. There is an awful sanctuary in every immortal spirit, and man needs nothing more than to exclude all else, and stand alone before himself, to be made conscious of an authority he can neither dethrone nor delude." p. 48. See also pp. 66, 67.

The style of this *Treatise* is generally perspicuous and vigorous. It illustrates the meaning of many words by their etymological history. It admits some phrases to which the English ear is not universally accustomed. We read that we may "awaken an *imperative*," that "the ultimate right *found*s upon the excellency of rational spirit itself;" we read of "the ends of highest piety," "the theory of angel and archangel." Still, there is a freshness about the language, and often a peculiar definiteness, which charm the reader. We suppose that an author like Dr. Hickok has a right to use the Germanisms and Gallicisms of the day, when precision of style requires them; although in a Class Book for Colleges it is peculiarly needful to adhere as sacredly as possible to the purity of our English idiom.

We should be happy to discuss at length the ethical principles of Dr. Hickok, but we reserve this discussion for some subsequent Number of our Review. We will here only add, that the *Treatise*, as all who know Dr. Hickok may well suppose, is an able one, and deserves the study of all clergymen, moralists, and general scholars.

II. DR. BEECHER'S CONFLICT OF AGES.¹

THIS volume is the fruit of original investigation. Every page of it bears the impress of a mind which thinks for itself. The doctrine of the soul's preëxistence has, indeed, been advocated by divines of preceding generations; but not in the form which Dr. Beecher has given it. Julius Müller, the leading evangelical theologian of Germany, has in recent days defended the notion of our preëxistence, but his elaborate treatise on Sin was not examined by Dr. Beecher, until the main theory of the Conflict of Ages had been matured in the author's mind. The resemblance of Dr. Beecher's theory to that of the illustrious German divine, will tend to rescue the theory from the ridicule with which our practical countrymen are disposed to treat all such speculations. It cannot be said, however, that the American divine has borrowed materials from the German. He has written with obvious independence of thought, although, in popular estimation, his volume will probably derive aid from its companionship with the celebrated treatise of Müller. It will be treated in a scholarly, as distinct from a savage spirit.

The present volume will confirm men in the opinion, which all who know

¹ The Conflict of Ages; or, The Great Debate on the Moral Relations of God and Man. By Edward Beecher, D. D. Boston; Phillips, Sampson & Company. 1853. pp. 552. 12mo.

Dr. Beecher have been wont to entertain, that he is a man of profound and varied learning; of sincere, deep piety. No one can peruse this new treatise without perceiving its author's earnestness, seriousness, honesty; his solemn reflection and his large acquisitions. The volume exhibits an unusual degree of candor. Its author treats his opponents with marked kindness. He is fairer to them than to his old friends. It is a fact of very rare occurrence in our selfish world, that a theological controversialist labors to do ample justice to the merits of those with whom he has been in conflict, and at the same time neglects to confer deserved honor upon those with whom he has generally been in sympathy. This fact, however, is exemplified in Dr. Beecher's volume. His candor fails, where men would least expect it to fail, in behalf of those with whom he has been thought to sympathize. His failing leans to virtue's side; nevertheless, it is a failing. Let justice be done, even though one's own friends be the gainers thereby. The main tendency of Dr. Beecher's volume is less favorable to what is distinctively named New England Theology, than to some of the systems opposed to it. By various implications, by certain connections, and by his general style of discussion, he lends plausibility to the singular charge, that the system of Hopkins, West, Spring, has tendencies, more or less latent, to Pelagianism. We think, also, that he gives to President Edwards a less prominent place among the advocates of New England Theology, than ought to be assigned to that eminent man. And among the opponents of this theology he has classed some divines who are really its friends. We are apprehensive that Dr. Beecher has made these wrong impressions inadvertently. In his amiable and certainly very honorable desire to avoid all misrepresentation of one class of theologians, he has, relying on the proverbial forbearance of another class, unintentionally left them without the defences to which they are fairly entitled. The impression of a writer's words upon other men is often different from that which he intends to make.

Pervading the entire volume of our esteemed author, is the implication, that the profoundest piety of the church is associated with the doctrine of sin before sinning, and that this doctrine of guilt antecedent to action is obviously and flagrantly inconsistent with the moral character of God. This inconsistency is stated in the strongest language. That an omnipotent Being should give to new-created minds a nature sinful antecedently to choice, and inevitably so, is pronounced unfair, unjust, dishonorable, cruel, etc. If now we admit that the doctrine of passive, ante-natal sin is thus derogatory to the Divine character, we must ask whether it can be consistent with profound piety? Is there not an anterior probability against the supposition, that the purest godliness of men has been nurtured in connection with a doctrine which evidently impugns the Divine goodness? Piety is love to God; and is it not probable that love to God will be impaired by a theory which represents him (if we admit Dr. Beecher's concessions) as guilty of meanness and of cruelty? Can it be that the system which exhibits the Most High as fair, just and honorable, is associated with a superficial piety?

Of how much use is the truth, if, even on the most fundamental doctrines, such as the very honesty of Jehovah, it be connected with an impoverished religion; and how much harm belongs to error, if the flagrant falsehood that Jehovah perpetrates injustice on the weak, that he is thus chargeable with a foul crime, be conjoined with the richest devotion? If there be any worth in right doctrine, our learned author must feel compelled to allow, either that true love to God has not been encouraged under a system which robs God of his moral excellence, or else that the assertion of a sinful nature antecedent to free choice is consistent with the probity of the Most High. Will it be replied, that the advocates of passive and inevitable sin at birth, have not discovered the incompatibility of their dogma with the moral excellence of Jehovah? But this incompatibility is represented, in the volume before us, as very apparent, striking, enormous; and the advocates of necessary constitutional sin are represented as perspicacious and astute. Could they not, then, must they not, have detected the fact which is declared to be so evident and even glaring? If their intellectual character were thus deficient, could their religious character be well proportioned, or worthy of our highest deference?

There is a second implication running through several chapters of this learned volume, that the doctrine of a passive nature, sinful inevitably before as well as after birth, is no more incongruous with the Divine benevolence, than is the doctrine of a nature so corrupted and deformed as to lead infallibly, but not inevitably, to actual sin. This implication has been often justified by other eminent divines. Can it be right? Is there no ethical difference between the theory that men *must* be guilty, and the theory that they *will* be so? between the belief that God makes our very natures sin, and the belief that he makes them such that sin will freely result? between the doctrine that by an act of God, moral guilt is made necessary *before* the commencement of free agency, and the doctrine that it is made certain, though not necessary, in the free unforced action of sinners. The fundamental laws of human belief require us to make a distinction between an act which man electively performs, and a state to which he is irresistibly subjected; and our instinctive sentiments are decidedly less hostile to the supposition, that we are left with a nature which we certainly abuse in our free sinful preference, than to the supposition that we are made with a nature which is, without any personal choice of our own, deserving of everlasting punishment. In one of the many memoirs of Napoleon Bonaparte, we remember to have read, that when he was accused of poisoning his disabled soldiers in the Egyptian campaign, his friends justified him by the plea that the soldiers would have died within a few days, if they had not been poisoned, and he merely expedited the event which was certain without his aid, and by this trifling anticipation of the sick men's exit, he facilitated the march of his able-bodied soldiers! It is very common for men to apologize for an act which would otherwise have seemed to them criminal, by alleging that, if they had not committed it, still it would have been committed by

some one, and this future certainty of the performance is represented by them as no greater evil than their own present necessitating of it. But this is neither sound ethics nor safe theology.

There is a third implication pervading the vigorous work of Dr. Beecher, and, indeed, essential to his argument, that God has no right to place moral agents in a state of such moral disadvantage as will certainly result in their sin. But is it a *wrong in itself* for Him who alone comprehends the necessities of his universe, to subject a few of his creatures to a state of moral disadvantage? If *this be a wrong in itself*, then no circumstances can justify it. There cannot be a combination of events, there can be no amount of ante-Adamic iniquity, which will excuse the fact of their being born into a state of disastrous moral exposures, provided that it be intrinsically sinful to bring them into such a state. But men are introduced into this state by a holy God; therefore it is not inherently wrong to subject them to great moral disadvantages. And if this subjection be not reprehensible in itself, then circumstances may justify the Deity in causing it. Somewhere, in some way, at some period, the interests of the universe may demand it. We take but a narrow view of the universal scheme. We cannot specify the particulars in which other races, other worlds, may derive benefit from our exposure to inward and outward temptation. As this exposure is not itself criminal, so in causing us to be thus exposed, the Deity has done nothing amiss. We bow down before Him as the great Sovereign who comprehends the remote, and to us obscure, reasons for placing us in such a state of peril as actually results in sin. We have no right to say that the only possible reason for this exposure to these fearful dangers, must be the fact of our having voluntarily transgressed the law in a preëxistent state, or in the loins of our first parents. We are aware that many writers, claiming to be Calvinists *par excellence*, have denied that we are justly or equitably treated by Jehovah, unless we "voluntarily sinned in Adam." We deem it irreverent to limit thus the perfections of Jehovah, and to pronounce the judgment that he cannot have given us a "fair probation," nor treated us honorably, unless he have permitted us to commit a sin in some state anterior to our physical conception. There is no intrinsic necessity for such a judgment. The essentials of morality do not demand it. We are aware that Dr. Beecher has high Calvinistic authority for thus presenting (what seem to us) arbitrary conditions for God's righteousness. But we humbly conceive that no man has a right to prescribe such conditions as the nature of things does not obviously require. As we believe that we are subjected to moral disadvantages at birth, so we believe that He, who seeth the end from the beginning, has consulted the highest necessities of his kingdom in this mysterious economy, and we care not to know precisely, even if we were able to comprehend, all the grounds on which he has deemed it wise to introduce this economy. We have a faith that those grounds are sufficient. We are not disturbed by our ignorance of them.

This leads us to remark, that Dr. Beecher has, in our view, unduly mag-

nified the difficulties of explaining the righteousness of God in not preventing sin. If our Creator has not literally *necessitated* us to do evil, if he has presented to us powerful motives, as well as sufficient capacities, for the doing of good, if he has unequivocally expressed his will that we be holy as He is holy, we have no right to complain of Him for his introducing us into our present state of temptation. The virtues may be fortified, the entire character may be strengthened, by the resistance which we are capacitated and obligated to make to this temptation. What if we be unable to explain the specific reasons for the Divine plan? We may confide in the general reasons for it. There is a clear discrimination to be made between minutely specifying the Divine motives for a procedure, and believing in the general fact that those motives are infinitely pure. We confess that we do not feel the necessities for Dr. Beecher's ingenious theory; and even if it were logically accurate, we should be unable to perceive its great importance. Doubtless there are dark aspects in which we may view the existence of moral evil; but they are not so dark as to jeopard the faith of reasonable men in the Divine perfections.

But while we think that this excellent author has overstated the difficulties of the problem which he has undertaken to solve, we cannot ascertain that the real difficulties of it are met by his own hypothesis more satisfactorily than by some of the hypotheses which he condemns. He has pushed the difficulties back into an obscure ante-mundane state, but they are still as real, even if not so apparent, as in the broad sunlight of this terrestrial sphere. His theory is that our souls existed before the creation of Adam, and in that state they sinned, and incurred all the evils of their present condition. But why did an omnipotent Ruler not prevent them from sinning in that preëxistent state? Dr. Beecher regards his theory as defensible, even if the introduction of sin into this pre-Adamic theatre be "a mysterious fact" (p. 174). But a common theory, which he opposes, may be defended (as it has been notoriously) by the same plea of "a mysterious fact." If the plea avail in one case, it may avail in the other. Again, Dr. Beecher would reconcile his theory with the moral perfections of God, by supposing that "God's power of disclosing himself and his system and his plans to his creatures, in their earliest generations, is limited" (p. 476). But a popular theory, which he impugns, has been defended by the plea, that God could not *consistently* prevent all sin in the present or any past generation of men. And is it easier to believe that Omnipotence cannot possibly prevent sin in the *first* generations of *creatures*, than to suppose that Infinite Holiness cannot *wisely* prevent all sin in the present generations of *men*? The objections against our learned author's hypothesis are greater, in our esteem, than are those against the more common hypothesis. Still again, Dr. Beecher deems it dishonorable for an infinitely powerful mind to inflict upon young frail children such evils as they now endure, provided that these imbecile creatures have not incurred the Divine displeasure in an ante-Adamic condition. But, if we are allowed thus to judge the actions

of one elevated so high above us, might we not ask whether it be not as really dishonorable for Him to reduce the once powerful but sinning spirits to a state of infancy, and, in that defenceless unconscious condition, to load them with evils the meaning and intent of which they cannot even divine? Is it not contrary to all analogy, for a wise Ruler to afflict his subjects in their most forlorn circumstances, without giving them any power of even conjecturing why they are thus afflicted! Is it not deemed honorable to spare a foe when he is reduced to a state of disease and imbecility? But in the infinity of the Divine plan, are there not reasons which we cannot fathom, and which, when even faintly conjectured, will dissipate all our doubts?

We find ourselves insensibly trenching upon a discussion of Dr. Beecher's theory. We do not intend to commence, in this Number of our Review, any thorough examination of that theory. We expect that it will be canvassed somewhat fundamentally, in a future paper. The incidental objections which we have proposed, are not so important as others which we might urge, did we not anticipate a more lengthened discussion of the whole theme. We dismiss the volume for the present with the brief remark, that, interesting as it is, it would be, in our apprehension, more attractive, if many of its repetitions were omitted, and if the quotations were accompanied with references to the volumes and pages whence they were taken, and if there were appended a full index to the volume. The book will be read in future times, and, as it contains much which a lover of truth will commend, as well as much which he will condemn, it calls for some addition to the great labor which has already been expended upon it.

III. HENGSTENBERG ON THE LORD'S DAY.¹

THIS pamphlet contains articles written at different times on the same general subject. The first article is new. It discusses all the passages in the Scriptures which bear directly on its subject, "Sabbath and Sunday." Next follows a double article, published in 1833, in the "*Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung*." The design of this is to develop, first, the history of doctrine on the relation of the Sabbath of the Jews to the Sunday of the Christians; and next, the author's own view of this relation. To these is added an extract from the opening article of the same journal for the year 1851. These various discussions may be assumed to put us in possession of the author's maturest views of the subject, in its more prominent aspects.

The style of the book is very characteristic of the author. It exhibits his usual vigor and thoroughness in research, his confidence in his own opinions, and his intolerance which often takes the form of contempt for the opinions of others. A strong national prejudice seems to have not a little influence on the author's mode of presenting his opinions, if not in their formation. We are continually reminded that it is the *English* view that he is opposing,

¹ Ueber den Tag des Herrn. Von E. W. Hengstenberg. Berlin. 1852. pp. 178.

and that "*our nation has peculiarly this mission, to explore the depths of God's word.*" We remember another singular exhibition of this prejudice. In criticizing some prize essays recently written in justification of the omission of the Apocrypha from common editions of the Bible (especially those circulated in Germany by the British and Foreign Bible Society), great emphasis was given to the fact (?) that the essayists were *paid with English gold!* These appeals to prejudice may be effective; but are they manly? will they promote the interests of science or religion? And yet we should be glad to see prevailing in Germany as earnest views as those of the author on the importance of the right observance of the Sabbath. The author evidently ascribes to the day a high sanctity, and endeavors to establish its observance on a Christian basis. He appreciates the signal blessings that have attended the English Sabbath, but ascribes these results to other causes, and anticipates great evils from what he believes to be the false principles on which its observance is justified. In Germany, his reasonings will be much more effective than here. A few years have wrought a great change there in the general estimation of the value and obligation of the Christian Sabbath. And some minds, repelled by theoretical objections to the English doctrine on the subject, may be attracted by a different presentation of the ground of duty. We, therefore, wish the author all possible success in what we believe to be his earnest endeavor, to promote the general consecration of the day to religious purposes.

But what is the basis of the author's doctrine? He holds the Sabbath to be purely a Mosaic institution. He insists that there is not the slightest evidence of its observance before the time of Moses. The account of the creation bears decidedly an Israelitic stamp. God's labor and rest are made typical of our duty. This is anticipative of the giving of the law. This notice of the Sabbath presupposes the fall and its curse. The conduct of the Israelites in the desert before the giving of the law shows that the institution was entirely novel to them. With the giving of the law obligation to keep the Sabbath commences, for the Sabbath had no existence as an institution before. The decalogue is inseparably connected with the whole Mosaic economy. It stands and falls with the ceremonial law. But its spirit and its Divine sanction remain under the New Testament. The rest of the Sabbath is not the end of its institution, but a means to that end, and of the greatest importance to the observance of the day, to life in God and the permanence of the church.

The transfer of its observance to the first day of the week rests on the authority of the church, which, however, can absolutely effect no more than create a favorable judgment. The obligation to observe one such day is indicated in the command of the decalogue, which has not lost, but rather gained, power over us. Under a dead Judaism many associations had gathered about the seventh day, which would go far to modify its power under the new economy. A change was desirable, and Christ's resurrection suggested the transfer of the observance of the Sabbath to the first day of the

week. And yet to the free church of the New Testament there is left far greater liberty than to the Jews. The Sabbath is no longer to us a legal institution.

In examining the history of doctrine on the subject, the author attempts to confirm his position by citations from Justin, Tertullian, Augustine, Jerome, Beda, Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Melancthon, the Genevan and Heidelberg Catechisms, the Helvetic Confession, etc. The English theory, he maintains, was first fully developed in the controversies between the Presbyterians and Episcopalians in England.

The author's main objections to what he calls the English theory, are, that there is no evidence of the institution of the Sabbath before the time of Moses; Genesis ii. contains no command, nor any intimation, that Jehovah communicated to men the sanction given to the seventh day as Sabbath; and there is no proof that any early people, except the Hebrews, or that they, before the time of Moses, kept sacred the seventh day of the week. Again, the decalogue, whose fourth command requires the keeping of the Sabbath, is merely the quintessence, the compend of the Mosaic economy, and stands or falls as law with it. God's peculiar relation to Israel is the ground of their obligation to obey all these laws. The common distinction between moral and ceremonial law is a pure invention of theologians. All is in its spirit still binding; all is as a letter dead. If the law of the Sabbath is perpetual as law, where is the authority for transferring its observance to another day? Can the authority of the church alter such a law of God? No such laws regulating external observance are given to the free church of the New Testament. The free, spontaneous utterance of Christian feeling designated the first day of the week as the day to be observed in the church, and the choice has stood for eighteen centuries, sanctioned by unnumbered evidences of Divine approval.

This book, while containing much that we cannot assent to, has been to us very interesting. It may well prompt us to review, if not to revise, the grounds on which we have been wont to justify our observance of the Sabbath. Again we express the wish that it may do much to restore the authority of the Sabbath in Germany; not merely its formal observance, but the recognition of its spirit and power. All antecedents in Germany, except for brief periods and within a narrow range, are against a strict observance of the Sabbath. Tholuck, in his late work on "the Spirit of the Wittenberg theologians," brings out the fact, that in Wittenberg itself, within the century following the Reformation, the successors of Luther and Melancthon held their lectures, disputations, session of the senate, etc. on Sunday, without offence. Whether such views as those of Hengstenberg will practically secure universal reverence for the Sabbath, and its right observance, has not been practically proved. A right theory concerning the nature and authority of the Sabbath, is unquestionably necessary to its permanent influence. But in Germany practical results and tendencies are far too little regarded in determining the correctness of theories.

A.

IV. TISCHENDORF'S APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.¹

THIS last is one of the most interesting of the author's numerous contributions to our theological literature. The rapidity with which his valuable contributions follow one another, leads us to distrust somewhat his thoroughness. But as our independent sources of information and grounds of judgment are limited, we cannot test his accuracy as we would. The editor has done much within a few years to call attention to the value of this apocryphal literature of the early church, and to put it within the reach of Biblical students. His prize essay, "*De evangeliorum apocryphorum origine et usu*" (1851), which he promises in a revised edition, discusses these points at length. In the dedication and prolegomena of the volume before us, he suggests briefly the importance of his work, calling attention chiefly to the fact, that these apocryphal gospels confirm, both by their nature and their history, the Divine authority of the canonical books, and by their own falsity eminently illustrate the credibility of these. They exhibit the spirit of the age in which they originated, and throw light on the popular fables and opinions which grew out of them, as well as on the history of doctrines, rites and customs. They show what authority the canonical gospels had in the early periods of the church; they illustrate the language in which these were written, the subjects of which they treat, and the interpretations which they have experienced. These gospels have always attracted more attention than any other branch of the apocryphal Christian literature, and most of them have been often, though imperfectly, edited.

This volume contains twenty-one works of this class, six of which and part of another are now edited for the first time. The editor claims to have read more than forty manuscript and other authorities which have not been accessible to former editors. He divides these gospels into three classes. The first, relating to the parents and parentage of Jesus, includes the *Prot-evangelium Jacobi*, *Pseudo-Matthæus*, *de nativitate Mariæ*, and the *Historia Josephi fabri lignarii*. The second class, relating to the infancy of Jesus, comprises the *Evangelium Thomæ*, in two Greek and one Latin revision, and the *Evangelium infantiae*, in a Latin version from the Arabic. The third class relates to the Saviour's fate, and contains the *Gesta Pilati*, in two Greek and one Latin form, the *Descensus Christi ad inferos*, in one Greek and two Latin revisions, the *Anaphora Pilati*, in two Greek forms, the *Paradosis Pilati*, *Pilati Epistola*, *Mors Pilati*, *Josephi narratio*, and *Vindicta Salvatoris*. Various readings are given with great fulness where there is a discrepancy among authorities. We thank the editor for bringing before us, in a form so convenient and attractive, so much valuable material.

A.

¹ *Evangelia Apocrypha*, etc., edidit Constantinus Tischendorf. Lipsiæ. 1853. pp. lxxxviii. and 463.

V. VENEMA'S THEOLOGY.¹

THIS work was published in 1850, in Edinburgh, by T. and T. Clark; in London, by Hamilton, Adams and Co.; in Dublin, by John Robertson. We are happy to see the American imprint, and to learn that the work finds an encouraging sale in this country. The history of the volume is thus given in the Translator's Preface:

"Hermann Venema was a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, and succeeded the younger Vitringa, as Professor of Theology in the University of Franeker, in Friesland.

"His 'Institutes of Theology,' the first volume of which, in English, is now submitted to the reader, were never published in the original language. The work exists only in manuscript, and came into the possession of the Translator some few years ago.

"The genuineness of the 'Institutes' was naturally at first a subject of doubt. But, as the work of translation proceeded, that doubt was completely removed. The marked identity between the style in which they are written and that of his printed works — the repeated references which he makes to these works, and especially to his 'Ecclesiastical History' — and even the particular way in which, in both the one and the other, the sections and paragraphs are marked — make it certain that they proceeded from his pen.

"In regard to the character of these 'Institutes,' the Translator will say nothing here. Should the reception which this volume meets with encourage the publication of the second, he will accompany it with an account of the Author, and with some observations on his Theological writings which could not be contained within the limits of a preface.

"He may be permitted, however, to remark that the peculiar views which the Author entertains on some points attach only to those on which divines have agreed to differ, and that nothing will be met with in this volume to affect, except in the way of increase, the high estimation in which he has uniformly been held as a learned divine and a godly man.

"In every work of this kind, the original is not improved (if it be not injured), by translation. And the indulgence of the reader is more particularly solicited in regard to that which is now presented to him, inasmuch as the deciphering of a manuscript has its own peculiar difficulties, in addition to those which attend the transference of its contents from one language to another.

"The notes appended are the Translator's, and for these alone he is responsible."

Only the first volume of the work is now published, and this is devoted to the Nature and Character of God; his works of Creation and Providence; the doctrines of Sin, the Fall and the Effects of the Fall. The subjects of the Atonement, Justification, Sanctification, Saint's Perseverance, the Sac-

¹ Translation of Hermann Venema's Inedited Institutes of Theology. By the Rev. Alex. W. Brown, Minister of Free St. Bernard's Church, Edinburgh. Andover: W. F. Draper & Brother. 1853. pp. 532. 8vo.

raments, etc., are reserved for a future volume. A perusal of what has been published already, excites within us a longing to read more, and we trust that the sale of the work in America and Great Britain will encourage the translator and publishers to persevere in the beneficent work which they have commenced.

Many interesting reflections are suggested by the study of this Treatise, now rescued from the oblivion which had threatened it. We see anew the excellences and the faults of the old theologians; the particulars in which they surpassed, and those in which they are obviously inferior to the divines of recent days. Venema and his contemporaries had more of the form, but less of the substantial excellence of logic, than belongs to American and the recent English theologians. His distinctions are multiplied and acute, and it is a healthful exercise of mind to study them; but they are sometimes too tenuous for our practical and impatient age. Where the idea is capable of a very plain and simple statement, we find the incumbrance of scholastic discriminations, giving the appearance of greater depth than exists really. Thus we notice a commendation of the division which the schoolmen made of grace: *gratia gratis dans*, *gratia gratis data*, and *gratia gratum faciens*; a division, the value of which is not equal to its pretensions. Still it is important to understand the distinctions which have been made by scholastic divines; for they have a factitious, even where but little intrinsic, worth.

There is a singular coincidence between the conclusions of the older and those of the more recent theologians, but there is a marked dissimilarity between the processes taken by the former and those adopted by the latter, to reach these conclusions. A deep Christian consciousness lies under the reasonings of good men, and leads them often to right results through a variety of unsound arguments. Venema often presses his way to the truth through trains of reasoning which modern logic declares to be inconsequent. Some of his conclusions he seems to adopt, and that wisely, not on account of, but in despite of, the reasons assigned for them. The perusal of such treatises as Venema's, illustrates the admirable adaptedness of truth to our moral nature; the powerful hold which it takes of our religious feelings. As we suppose that Plato felt in reality but little influence from some of his reasonings for our immortality, but believed in this truth chiefly by the force of his moral demands for it, so many of the older theologians had so firm faith in doctrines which might have been defended by irrefutable argument, that they did not feel the need of rigidly trying the proofs which they used, but often produced such argument as would have failed them, had they really leaned upon it. The pillars were better fitted for ornament than for use.

Another reflection suggested to us by the study of the old theologians, is, that their systems have a striking resemblance to each other. The men were strong thinkers, but they did not study variety even in their style of writing. When, for instance, we examine their instructions on the eternity of God, we can anticipate, at the outset, what those instructions will be.

We predict, and we seldom err in the prediction, that we shall be told of God's eternity as involving no succession, because, if there were succession, there would be a beginning, there would be parts, and if parts then no infinite whole. We expect to read of his eternity as the *punctum stans*, the central point of the circle which represents the past, present and future time, and this point has the same relation to all parts of the circle; Venema, pp. 143, 144. We expect to see his eternity compared to the gnomon of the sundial, standing perpendicular on one spot while it marks the progressive changes of the sun, these changes being symbols of the mutations of time; or to the tower, standing erect and still, in the midst of a stream of water which is now touched by some parts of the stream, representing time present, and which has been touched by other parts of the stream representing time past, and which will be touched by still other parts of the stream representing time future. Such infelicitous comparisons are used less frequently by our modern divines; and it must be said that we recognize among the moderns less imitation of each other than we find among the ancients. The advance of science has opened more exuberant stores of illustration, and has increased the fertility of the mind in explaining abstruse thoughts.

It must be admitted, however, that Venema had far more independence, both of thought and style, than belonged to many of his contemporaries. We have been somewhat surprised at the boldness with which he has advanced some speculations at variance with the opinions of men whom in the main he revered highly. Thus he maintains that the death threatened to Adam was corporeal death, and did not include spiritual death which he defines to be "a continual course of sinning, a habitual violation of the law which enjoins love to God and to man, proceeding from the fixed principle of self-love and of carnal desire." He says;

"If by spiritual death we understand habitual, deep-rooted, invincible moral depravity, then our only answer is, that it is to be regarded not only as a consequence of the transgression of the prohibition by the permission of God, but also as a delivering over to judgment, inasmuch as man by that one sin fell into that complete moral depravity which we call spiritual death. But if the question be, whether spiritual death is comprehended in the threatening, and is to be considered in the light of the punishment of sin properly so called, then we reply in the negative:

"(1) Because the phrase 'thou shalt surely die' has no such meaning in the Old Testament. We nowhere meet with death employed to denote moral depravity, nor does it occur in this sense in any part of Scripture, but always in the sense of temporal death which does not last for ever.

"(2) This moral depravity does not properly bear the aspect of punishment, because it is inconsistent with the character of God, as a holy and righteous Being, to inflict such depravity in the way of punishment. For that is strictly speaking penal in its nature which a judge may inflict. But God cannot be the author of sin, and therefore as a judge he cannot inflict it. He may, indeed, give man up to depravity, Rom. 1: 24, but he cannot properly inflict it as a punishment, or inflict any punishment opposed to his own perfections, which moral depravity is.

The death, therefore, referred to in the threatening does not mean this depravity, but the evil consequences which flow from it.

"(3) That which is the cause of punishment cannot be properly called a punishment. Now the violation of a precept is the cause of punishment. But moral depravity and the continual violation of the law, whether in habit or in act, cannot both be regarded as penal, unless we wish to confound two things, the cause namely and its effect.

"(4) This death, moreover, was placed in opposition to the promised life. But the life promised, which man would have attained by keeping the law, was not strictly speaking holiness, but its reward. The death also is therefore not properly depravity, but the evil resulting from depravity, and the punishment inflicted on account of it." pp. 437, 438.

The perusal of Venema's treatise cannot fail, we think, to awaken a spirit of Biblical investigation, and to illustrate the importance of an accurate and well-balanced theological system.

VI. MEMOIRS OF HORNER.¹

THE English edition of this work was published in 1843. About a hundred pages of new matter are added to the American edition by the biographer, and give it a value much exceeding that of the English copy. The paper and type of the American edition are a feast to the eye. It is adorned with a very beautiful engraving of Mr. Horner, and also of the statue erected to his memory in Westminster Abbey. The literary execution of the work is admirable. To watch the life of a man immersed in political discussion, familiar with the contests and intrigues of Parliament, and at the same time engaged in the pursuits of science and general literature, and ever indulging himself in placid or majestic thoughts, cannot be otherwise than refreshing. The information imparted by these volumes in regard to the life of Jeffrey, Brougham, Mackintosh, Fox, Pitt, Hallam, Sir Samuel Romilly, Lord Holland, Lord Grenville, Malthus, Charles Bell, Earl Grey, and other public men, is of great interest. Numerous passages like the following, occur in the work, all of them rich in historical suggestion, yet expressed in modest language. "This [the Edinburgh] Review was concerted, about the end of last winter [1802], between Jeffrey, Sidney Smith, and myself. The plan was immediately communicated to Murray, Allen and Hamilton; Brown, Brougham and the two Thomsons have gradually been made parties" (Vol. I. p. 209). "Upon the whole, I do not think we have gained much character by it; it is considered as respectable enough in point of talents, but the severity — in some of the papers it may be called scurrility — has given general dissatisfaction. In the next number, we must soften our tone, and be more indulgent to folly and to bad taste. Jeffrey is the person

¹ *Memoirs and Correspondence of Francis Horner, M. P.* Edited by his brother, Leonard Horner, Esq., F. R. S. In two volumes. 8vo. pp. 554 and 575. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1853.

who will derive most honor from this publication, as his articles in this number are generally known, and are incomparably the best. I have received the greater pleasure from this circumstance, because the genius of that little man has remained almost unknown to all but his most intimate acquaintances. His manner is not at first pleasing; what is worse, it is of that cast which almost irresistibly impresses upon strangers the idea of levity and superficial talents. Yet there is not any man whose real character is so much the reverse; he has, indeed, a very sportive and playful fancy, but it is accompanied with very extensive and varied information, with a readiness of apprehension almost intuitive, with judicious and calm discernment, with a profound and penetrating understanding. Indeed, both in point of candor and of vigor in the reasoning powers, I have never personally known a finer intellect than Jeffrey's, unless I were to except Allen's" (Vol. I. pp. 211, 212).

The expressions of Mr. Horner on the imprisonment of Napoleon Bonaparte at St. Helena (Vol. II. pp. 344, 345), are remarkable. His letter to a friend of Dugald Stewart, when that distinguished professor had been bereaved of a favorite son, is a beautiful exhibition of a scholar's tenderness of sensibility. Throughout the Correspondence of Horner, there are grateful allusions to Mr. Stewart (see Vol. I. pp. 331, 332; Vol. II. pp. 149, 308, 309). "I entirely agree with you," he says to a friend, "that the high and uniform tone of the purest and noblest morality, which breathes through the whole composition [Dissertation], is its principal charm; as it is that which distinguishes Mr. Stewart's writings, even more than his unrivalled beauty of style, from all the other works of the present day. It is like going into another climate, to pass to the serene and great prospects which he gives to the eye, and over which he spreads so many beauties of detail and so much sentiment, from the factious fever or flippant ingenuity which are so much the mode among his contemporaries" (Vol. II. p. 317). There is a touching sentiment conveyed in the following allusion to Mr. Stewart, written in Edinburgh, 1812. Mr. Stewart "is printing at present a memoir, which he read to the Royal Society of Edinburgh, upon the case of the blind and dumb boy, upon whose eye an operation was performed by Wardrop; it cannot fail to be a most interesting dissertation in the way in which he has treated the subject. My vanity will not let me conceal from you, that he has contrived, from the accident of my having sent him an old book, to pay me a very partial compliment, in a note to this memoir; it is not a little flattering, though I owe it to nothing but his good nature, to have his friendship for me recorded in writings which will live as long as those of Cicero and Plato, and will go down to distant times with their works" (Vol. II. p. 112).

In 1817, at the early age of thirty-nine, Mr. Horner died; and soon afterwards his friend, Mr. Stewart, expressed the following opinion of his great worth: "The united tribute of respect already paid by Mr. Horner's political friends and his political opponents, to his short but brilliant and spotless

career in public life, renders all additional eulogies on his merits as a statesman, equally feeble and superfluous. Of the extent and variety of his learning, the depth and accuracy of his scientific attainments, the classical (perhaps somewhat severe) purity of his taste, and the truly philosophical cast of his whole mind, none had better opportunities than myself to form a judgment, in the course of a friendship which commenced before he left the university, and which grew till the moment of his death. But on these rare endowments of his understanding, or the still rarer combination of virtues which shed over all his mental gifts a characteristical grace and a moral harmony, this is not the proper place to enlarge. Never, certainly, was more completely realized the ideal portrait so nobly imagined by the Roman poet: 'A calm devotion to reason and justice, the sanctuary of the heart undefiled, and a breast glowing with inborn honor.'

'Compositum jus fasque animo, sanctosque recessus
Mentis, et incoctum generoso pectus honesto.'

Had the volumes before us no other value (but they are rich in political, historical and philosophical teachings), they would be worthy of study, as exhibiting the delightful interest of literary men in each other, and the affectionate friendships which are found in scientific associations.

VII. DE VERE'S COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY.¹

COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY is of recent origin, dating back as a science but little beyond the commencement of the present century. The common source of different languages, and their affinities to each other, were not known to the scholars of antiquity. It is true that some of them furnished the materials for the comparative study of language. Herodotus made quotations from the Scythian, Median, and Egyptian, which are of value to the philologists of our own times; Socrates recognized the barbarian origin of many words and forms in use in his age; Plato and Aristotle have left many profound thoughts on the origin and nature of language; the subject of language, particularly the Latin, also received greater or less attention from Cicero, Cæsar, and Lucretius. But none of these thought of comparing their own language with that of other nations. As the effect of Roman influence, Polybius seems to have taken a step in advance of his predecessors, when he says in the introduction to his history, "that the history of one nation cannot be understood without taking the others into account." This is probably the clearest hint to be found, in antiquity, of the connection between the races, and consequently the languages.

The philosopher Leibnitz has the "honor of being called the father of

¹ Outlines of Comparative Philology, with a Sketch of the Languages of Europe, arranged upon Philological Principles; and a Brief History of the Art of Writing. By M. Schele De Vere, of the University of Virginia. New York: G. P. Putnam & Co. 1853. 12mo. pp. 434.

comparative philology." He made a successful classification of such languages as he was acquainted with; and, had he possessed the materials which have since been collected, he would have fallen below none of the honored names who have followed him, in the philosophical and comprehensive use made of them. But the progress was slow, as the means for extensive comparisons were not available.

The Latin and Greek languages had come to be more extensively and critically studied; the British possessions in India had, at length, given some of the English scholars an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the Sanskrit, a language in richness and refinement not inferior to the Greek. The knowledge of the Sanskrit acquired by scholars abroad, was soon communicated to those at home. The English scholars most eminent in promoting the study of this language were, Sir William Jones, Mr. H. T. Colebrooke, Sir Charles Wilkins, Mr. Halhed, and Prof. Wilson, who, by preparing grammars and lexicons of the language, by making translations from it, and furnishing learned essays for the Journals, had provided valuable means for the study of it, and had awakened much interest to learn what treasures it might contain. This language was subsequently cultivated in Germany, a knowledge of it having been derived from the English scholars. There it was studied much more extensively and critically than it had been in England. The great pioneers in this new department of study, were the Schlegels, Bopp, and William Humbolt.

We are thus particular in describing the progress of Sanskrit scholarship, as it was intimately connected with the growth of comparative philology, this science having made but little progress till the structure and genius of the Sanskrit were well understood.

Soon after the Sanskrit began to be studied, scholars were surprised to find a resemblance between it and several other languages. As early as 1778, Mr. Halhed says in the preface to his Bengal grammar: "I have been astonished to find the similitude of Sanskrit words with those of Persia, Arabic, and even of Latin and Greek;" and in 1808, Frederick Schlegel had "established the historical connection between the Sanskrit, Persian, Roman and Greek."

More extensive materials for a larger comparison of languages began to be supplied. In this, while the contributions of the Spanish missionaries and Spanish commerce are not to be overlooked, England rendered the most valuable service. Her numerous colonies, her extensive commerce, her missionaries, merchants and travellers, who had gone into all parts of her empire, gave her peculiar facilities for becoming acquainted with foreign languages. Lists or vocabularies of different languages were made; or the languages of particular nations or tribes were learned by the missionaries who had gone to convert them. In these and other ways collections of valuable materials were obtained. But in the true philosophical use to be made of these collections, the German scholars hold the first rank. The great names of Frederick Schlegel, Bopp, William Humbolt, Jacob Grimm,

and Pott, will ever be honored as the successful promoters of comparative philology, and as having raised it to the dignity of a well-established science.

The beneficial results of comparative philology are very important. The wildest fancies have been entertained respecting the origin of particular nations and languages. Many of these mistaken views this science has been the means of correcting. The fanciful claims which some French authors had set up, that their language was of "direct and unmixed descent from the ancient Greek," and of still others, that it was of Hebrew origin, and of others, that it was "pure Celtic," have been shown to have no better foundation than the opinion that the inhabitants of Anjou were the descendants of Esau, "because they were so fond of lentils." There had been a long and earnest search after the primitive language of the human race. Various languages claimed this distinction, the Celtic, Chinese, Abyssinian, Syriac and others, but their claims have all been disproved. Even the Hebrew, which had more generally been regarded as the original, primitive language, the language spoken in Eden, has been proved to be the offspring of some other mother-tongue. And the polished Greek, which up to our own day, has been considered older than the Latin, is now, in the opinion of the most eminent philologists, believed to be the younger of the two languages.

Up to the period of comparative philology, languages, for the most part, were thought to be isolated, with no common bond, with few or no affinities for each other; but now the languages most remote from one another, the far east and the far west, nations whose customs, government and general position are entirely different, are satisfactorily proved to have had a common origin. Such as on critical and scientific investigation proved to be of the same stock, were grouped together. The affinities of others, whose relation and origin were still undetected, and which, from some marked peculiarities, seemed incapable of being reduced to any classification, when subjected to a more minute and comprehensive study, were clearly established; and then they also were ranged with those of a like class. Thus one after another was brought within its own group, till nearly all the languages of Europe are proved to be of one stock, and find their common mother in the Sanskrit. And now the whole circle of languages is reduced by philologists to three classes or families. And if such an agreement has been found between languages to all appearance entirely disconnected with each other, may we not carry forward the analogy one step further, and reasonably expect, that, when new materials shall be collected, and a still wider range of study be adopted, an affinity may be discovered between these three classes, and the nations of the earth be found to be of one language?

Comparative philology also becomes an important source of history. The monuments and historical records of a nation do not preserve all that is most valuable; the language itself makes an earlier record than any history can do; it daguerreotypes shades and features of character, which history, at best, could transmit but imperfectly; it reveals, too, the migrations of

nations, and the different tribes and families with which they had been brought in contact; for when nations for a period have been associated, or brought into juxtaposition with each other, the evidence of the fact will be found in the foreign words or idioms introduced into the language. Our own language gives abundant proof of this.

The comparative study of language is regarded, also, as an important means of determining the origin of nations. "The principle has been established, that a similarity of language is *prima facie* evidence of community of descent. It is not absolute evidence; but it forms strong and plausible ground for the presumption that races distant from each other, however they may differ in color of skin and hair, or of [in ?] mental or moral development, if they call the same thing by the same name, and use the same forms or order of words to express the same shade of meaning, must either have carried on a continued and direct intercourse with each other or be closely related by common descent."¹

We have made these remarks with a view of calling attention to Mr. De Vere's interesting book, the object of which is to "give suggestive rather than complete information" respecting the object of comparative philology, and what it has done. The subjects of some of the chapters will show the interesting range of topics treated: What is language; unity of language; history of comparative philology; first attempts in comparative philology; literature of comparative philology; present state of comparative philology; practical results; comparative philology and history; comparative philology and recent discoveries; language and national character; Indo-European languages; the Sanskrit as oldest of the Indo-European languages; ruling languages of the world; purposes of comparative philology; physical influences operating on languages; conquest operating on language; occupation of a nation operating on language; fashion operating on language; literature operating on language; philosophical results of comparative philology; history of languages; decay of languages; increase of languages.

These are but a few of the seventy-five chapters into which the book is divided. The subjects are treated in an interesting and popular manner; they afford evidence that the author has made himself familiar with the best writers in this department of study, and that he has comprehensive and philosophical views of the great laws which govern language, under the different influences to which it is subjected. The book presents few novelties, and does not claim to be an advance upon the teachings of European scholars; but as a well-compacted and digested outline of comparative philology, it contains an amount of useful information which can be found in no English or American work besides.

The sketch and scientific classification of the languages of Europe, all finding their relations in Asia, the mother of languages as well as of nations, present a happy contrast to the absurd speculations of Dr. Murray, who maintains that all these languages originated from nine monosyllables.

¹ De Vere, p. 74.

The history of the art of writing, though not intended to be a full treatise, nor designed to discuss the perplexing questions of the origin and progress of that art, contains much valuable information on the general subject.

We observe some typographical errors in the work, though the number is not large; a few instances of infelicity and looseness of expression, and also an occasional epithet, such as *heaven-born* soul, *heaven-born* companion, *heaven-aspiring* Himalaya, which had better have been omitted. But these are quite infrequent and do not impair the general value of the book.

VIII. PROF. TYLER'S EDITIONS OF TACITUS.¹

WE have already given favorable notices of the previous editions of Prof. Tyler's books, accompanied by some criticisms and suggestions; and we are now glad to see, in the appearance of these new editions, evidences that the editor's labors have been deservedly appreciated. In the copies now before us, the text has been carefully revised and compared with the best German editions, and such changes made as were well established on critical grounds, or as the nature of the subject, or the usage of the author seemed to require. By this judicious criticism, several passages are rendered more perspicuous and consistent. The editor has shown good judgment in not adopting the rash emendations (often falsely so called) of some editors, though claiming the sanction of scholars of high authority.

Many of the Notes of this edition of the *Germania* and *Agricola* have been rewritten, and evince a wider range of study, and access to new and valuable materials for illustrating the text; they are likewise more grammatical and critical, and indicate an evident progress in the views of the editor, as the natural result of his patient and unsparing study of his author. The amount of the Notes, too, has been considerably increased. Some improvement will likewise be found in the geographical department of the *Germania*. "Particular attention has been paid" in this edition of the *Germania* "to the ethnology of the tribes and nations, in reference to whose origin and early history Tacitus is among the best authorities."

In the edition of the *Histories* fewer changes have been made, the editor having prepared this after the *Germania* and *Agricola*, when the course of his own studies and the use of his first volume as a text-book had suggested many improvements. Still, in the present edition the Notes have been re-examined, and compared with one of the best German editions, and such changes and additions introduced as the Professor's extended studies and the use of the book in his classes had suggested as desirable.

¹ The *Germania* and *Agricola* of Caius Cornelius Tacitus. With Notes for Colleges. By W. S. Tyler, Professor of the Greek and Latin languages in Amherst College. New Edition. New York: D. Appleton & Company. 1852. pp. xii. and 193.

The *Histories* of Caius Cornelius Tacitus. With Notes for Colleges. By W. S. Tyler, Professor of Languages in Amherst College. New York: D. Appleton & Company. 1852. pp. 453.

We look upon these editions, in their present improved form, as honorable proofs of ripe scholarship. In every part they give evidence of sound judgment and critical learning, and are admirably adapted to meet the wants of the student. They afford the right kind of helps. In addition to the critical and judicious annotations, which never do for the student what he ought to do for himself, the *Germania* and *Agricola* contain a graphic and faithfully-drawn life of Tacitus, and also short essays on the general design and nature of each of the treatises. The *Histories* are furnished with an able and extended Essay on the style of Tacitus, which will be found of great service to the student; and also with Preliminary Remarks, written with great beauty and force, on his writings, his credibility as a historian, and presenting a "view of the principal events and leading characteristics of the period" embraced in the histories of the author. The apparatus thus furnished for the study of the author is more complete than is usually found in similar works. We heartily recommend these books to the friends of sound classical learning.

IX. PAULY'S ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF CLASSICAL ANTIQUITIES.¹

THIS work is one of the many evidences of the continued advance in classical studies. Nearly a hundred and forty years since, Benjamin Hederic published his *Real-Schullexicon*, embracing the usual subjects of ancient geography, history, chronology and antiquities. The author, though a laborious student, was not a profound scholar. Three editions of it was published from 1717 to 1748. It was a work of considerable value for the times when it appeared, and continued to be used for a long period. But near the close of the last century, it was felt that there was need of a work on antiquities, which should fully represent the progress made up to that period in classical studies. This want was met by the appearance of the *New Real-Schullexicon* by C. P. Funke, containing the necessary helps for illustrating the ancient classics, particularly geography, history, philosophy, antiquities and mythology. This was a work of much learning and research, and is still a valuable store-house of information. It was published in five octavo volumes, the first in 1800, and the fifth in 1805. But the new impulse which has been given to the study of classical literature within the last fifty years, required that all the apparatus for study should be made more complete and comprehensive, furnishing the necessary helps on the great variety of new topics which are now made subjects of investigation. A great amount of material had been collected on all the subjects embraced within the widest circle of Antiquities, and on many of them entire treatises had been written, so minute and specific, that almost every phase of life, every usage and art, the institutions, government, laws, the civil and domestic relations of antiquity were well understood.

¹ *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft in alphabetischer Ordnung.* Herausgegeben von August Pauly, Professor in Stuttgart.

From the rich materials thus accessible, as well as from the labors of earlier scholars who had written on similar subjects, the present work has been prepared with great labor and learning. It is comprised in six octavo volumes (bound in seven), the whole making nearly eleven thousand pages. The first volume appeared in 1839, the last in 1852. The editors were assisted by more than fifty distinguished scholars as contributors, each furnishing articles in a particular department. The first three volumes were edited by Prof. Pauly. But during the progress of the fourth volume, his labors in connection with the work were terminated by death, in 1845. The work was then edited by Chr. Walz and W. S. Teuffel, Professors of Philology at Tübingen.

The following view of the principal subjects treated, will show the wide field of investigation embraced in the work: Biography, mythology, geography, mathematical geography, uranography, chronology, archaeology of art, ethnography of Italy, Roman tribes geographically considered, topography of Rome, topography of Attica, military affairs, public and legal antiquities, political history, literary history, numismatics, epigraphics, domestic and social life of the ancients, their customs, proverbs, national songs, festivals and games; history of religion, antiquities of the Drama, Egyptian worship. These and other subjects are elaborately treated, and indicate patient and extensive research.

In the Articles on the Grecian and Roman authors, in addition to the biographical sketch and general estimate of their characters, notices are given of their several works, the nature and design of each being considered by itself. The principal editions of each are also named, and the most valuable helps for illustrating them.

The work contains investigations, discussions, and varied sources of information which can be found nowhere else in so accessible a form, and will fully answer the objects for which it was prepared.

ARTICLE XI.

SELECT THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

OUR intelligence from Germany is quite fragmentary. We select some of the more interesting items. We notice unusual activity among Catholic scholars in Europe. Many controversial works have recently appeared; others defining Catholic philosophy and theology, and a few bearing on

Biblical Literature. We see that Catholics are watching one another's orthodoxy, as well as contending against Protestantism.

Alliot's version of the Bible is advancing toward completion.

The second and last volume of Dr. Martin's translation (with notes) of Josephus's *Jewish Antiquities* has just appeared.

Dr. L. Reinke has published a second volume of his "Contributions to the Explanation of the Old Testament," containing a general introduction to the prophecies, two exegetico-historical articles, and some supplementary remarks on Vol. I.

Another volume (the second) of "German Catholicism in its development," traces its history through the memorable years 1848-9.

Protestant exegetical literature has not been very much enriched by the contributions of the last quarter. To promote the general study of "Isagogik," several new works have appeared. K. F. Keil gives us an Introduction to the Old Testament; Dr. L. Noack (just now a very prolific writer), "Biblical Theology, and Introduction to the Old and New Testaments, and Exhibition of the doctrinal substance of the books of the Bible, according to their origin and historical relations," and Guericke a second thoroughly revised edition of his Introduction to the New Testament.

Delitzsch has prepared a new edition of his Commentary on Genesis. It will be remembered that this work, first published last year, attracted much attention as being quite liberal, considering the antecedents and connections of the author.

Part XIV. of the "Compendious exegetical Manual to the Old Testament" contains a Commentary on the Psalms by Justus Olshausen. It has just appeared. Parts XII. and XIII. (if we mistake not prepared by Bertheau) are in press. L. Diestel edits a Commentary on Gen. xlix., Jacob's blessing.

Parts 3 and 4 of Dr. E. Meier's "Scriptures of the Old Testament translated and explained," contain Job and Proverbs.

A Commentary on Baruch has just been published, from the pen of F. H. Rensch.

Two more parts of the Compendious Commentary on the Apocrypha by Fritzsche and Grimm have appeared, containing, Part 2, the books of Tobit and Judith; and Part 3, 1 Maccabees.

Dr. R. Stier has just published a defence of the Continental custom of including the Apocrypha in editions of the Bible. On the other side, P. F. Keerl has written a reply to Hengstenberg, entitled "The Word of God and the Apocrypha of the Old Testament."

Wahl's *Clavis* to the Apocrypha is complete.

Two numbers of the third (the only remaining) volume of Stier and Theile's Polyglott Bible are just out. This volume is to contain the Hagiographa.

A third edition of H. A. W. Meyer's Commentary on Matthew has appeared.

Isaac da Costa has published "The Apostle John and his Writings—a

Biblical study." This writer's "Four Witnesses" makes us wish to see his works in a language more intelligible to us than the Hollandish.

Vol. I. Part 1 of J. P. Lange's *History of the Church* gives his views of the Apostolical Age.

Dr. F. C. Baur has just written a work on Christianity and the Church of the first three centuries. This will give us the key to the author's theories concerning the origin of the books of the New Testament more fully than any other of his works.

We have further from G. Volckmar "Justin Martyr and his relation to our Gospels," and from Sartori an exegetical and critical treatise on the Epistle to the Laodiceans.

Dr. H. Grätz has commenced a *History of the Jews* from the earliest times to the present. The publication commences with the fourth volume, which gives their history from the fall of the Jewish State to the completion of the Talmud (pp. xvi. and 565).

We have from A. Hilgenfeld "The Apostolical Fathers,—an inquiry into the contents and origin of the writings preserved under their name," and from F. M. Perthes, a life of Chrysostom.

A third edition of Schmid's "Dogmatics of the evangelical Lutheran Church," has just appeared. Among the lamented author's papers was found a work entitled "Biblical Theology of the New Testament." It consists of two parts, the life and doctrine of Jesus, and the life and doctrine of the Apostles. It is to be published under the supervision of Dr. Weizsäcker.

R. A. Lipsius has published a little work on Paul's doctrine of Justification, and the related doctrines.

Zeller is preparing a work on Zuingli's Theological System.

Dr. L. Noack has published a work on Christian Mysticism, in two parts: the Mysticism of the Middle Ages, and Mysticism since the Reformation.

We see announced from Dr. W. Böhmer a "System of Christian Life;" from J. L. Jacobi a sketch of the doctrine of the Irvingites compared with the Scriptures, and from F. G. Nottebaum, a treatise "De personae vel hypostatis apud patres theologosque notione et usu."

Prof. Herzog of Halle has just published a work on the Romanic Waldenses, their circumstances and doctrines before the Reformation, their Reformation in the sixteenth century and its results. The sources are chiefly their own writings. •

Vol. II. of Cröger's *History of the revived Church of the United Brethren*, contains their history during the years 1741—60.

Vol. II. of Weber's *History of the Anti-Catholic Churches and Sects of Great Britain*, contains "The Constructive part of the Reformation, and the formation of the Puritan Sect" (pp. viii. and 704).

J. B. Leu edits a little work on Clement XIV. and the Jesuits.

Dr. L. Noack has published the first part of a work on "Freethinkers in Religion." It gives a sketch of the English Deists. Two parts are to follow, containing an exhibition of the corresponding religious illumination in France and Germany.

Six parts of the *Real-Encyclopädie* edited by Prof. Herzog are ready. The work can be had in half-volumes of five parts each. Ten volumes complete the work.

Vol. IV. Part 1 of Daniel's *Codex Liturgicus* contains liturgies of the Oriental Church.

Thilo's "Selections from Athanasius" (Vol. I. of his *Bibliotheca patrum Graecorum dogmatica*) has appeared (pp. 1005).

Erdmann's Attempt at a scientific exhibition of the History of Modern Philosophy" is complete. Vol. III. Part 2, which is just out, contains "The development of German speculation since Kant" (pp. vii. and 858).

Ritter's History of Philosophy is after twenty years labor finished. The last volume (being Vol. XII. of the whole work, Vol. VIII. of the History of Christian Philosophy, and Vol. IV. of the History of Modern Philosophy), contains four books. Book 7, treats of the modification of Theosophy into Metaphysics by the younger Helmont and Leibnitz. Book 8, of Idealism and Scepticism in England, discussing Collier, Berkeley and Hume. Book 9, of Sensualism and Naturalism in France, giving sketches of the systems of Condillac, Helvetius and Holbach; and Book 10, of "Circumstances and Prospects in the Philosophy of the eighteenth century," with special reference to Welf, Reid, Burke, Hemsterhuis, Montesquieu and Rousseau.

Unusual attention has been lately given in Germany to the study of heathen systems of religion and mythology, ancient and modern. Among the works announced as published or in preparation, we notice the following: Vol. II. of Rinck's *Religion of the Hellenes*; Vol. VII. of Schwenk's *Mythology of the Asiatic nations, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, etc.*, containing the *Mythology of the Slavic nations*; and Part 2 of Wuttke's *History of Heathenism*, treating of the "Spiritual life of the Chinese, Japanese and Indians."

Karl Simrock announces a *Manual of German Mythology* (including the Northern) in three volumes. Vol. I. is to contain the History of the world and of the Gods.

Dr. J. N. Sepp has published, in three volumes, a work on "Heathenism in its significance in relation to Christianity."

We have also from Prof. H. Rückert, Vol. I. of a *History of the Civilization of the German people at the time of the transition from heathenism to Christianity*.

Prof. W. Wachsmuth of Leipzig is publishing a *History of political parties in ancient and modern times*. Vol. I., which has just appeared, contains a sketch of the "Political Parties of Antiquity."

Vol. I. Part 1 of a fourth edition of Hermann's *Political Antiquities of Greece* is just from the press.

We have from Dr. Tobler the first of two books on the *Topography of Jerusalem and its environs*. This volume is confined to the Holy City (pp. cvi. and 677).

Dr. Gamprecht is publishing an account of Barth and Overweg's Expedition into Central Africa,

A second edition of Jacob Grimm's *History of the German Language* has appeared.

Considerable zeal is manifested in the study of the English language and literature. Critics are discussing the merits of Collier's *Emendations to Shakspeare*. Dr. Otto Behnsch has published a *History of the English language and literature*. A manual of English national literature by L. Herrig has reached a fourth edition. The author has just prepared a similar history of North American literature.

One of the most recent and valuable German contributions to philology is a *Celtic Grammar* by J. C. Zeus. It is contained in two large volumes (pp. lvi. and 1168).

Uhlemann's *Coptic Grammar* is just out.

Petermann has published Schwarze's translation of the "*Pistis Sophia*."

Dr. F. A. Arnold has prepared, chiefly from manuscript sources, a valuable *Arabic Chrestomathy*.

J. A. Vullers has published the first number of a new *Persian and Latin Lexicon* (pp. 208).

Six numbers of Grimm's *German Lexicon* have been published.

Two volumes are to be added to *Kayser's Bücher-Lexicon*, bringing down the work through the publications of 1852. It is to appear in half-volumes, the first of which has just been published.

Dr. J. Petzholdt, Librarian to Prince John of Saxony, has just published a *Manual of German Libraries*.

Dr. W. Freund, the eminent lexicographer, has just returned from a tour in Ancient Bhaetia, the ethnographical and linguistic results of which he will soon give to the public.

The annual volume of the Berlin Academy of Sciences for 1852, contains, among other interesting articles, two by Prof. Lepsius on important questions in Egyptian history. One treats of the twelfth dynasty as designated by Manetho, the other exhibits some of the results of the study of Egyptian monuments connected with the reigns of the Ptolemies. It is interesting to see what valuable results have been already secured by the study of these hieroglyphical records; with what precision the history of a dynasty that passed away more than 2000 years before the Christian era, can be restored. The number of the kings is determined, and their names, and the length of their reigns, sometimes in years, months and days. The imperfect and faulty records of Eusebius, Africanus and Syncellus are corrected and deficiencies supplied. More than 100 monuments now exist on which are *dated* records belonging to this period. These throw light on each other, and, though far from giving a perfect chronology, they supply many valuable facts. We may rely more fully on these results, for the system by which they were reached may be tested by applying it to a dynasty almost two thousand years later, with which we have long been acquainted through Greek and Roman histories. But it is not merely as a test that this application to later history is valuable. Our knowledge of the Ptolemies has always been more or less imperfect or confused. The monuments add much that is valuable to our

knowledge of them, their number, the order of their succession, their personal and family history. These two essays exhibit the results of long, cautious and discriminating study, in an attractive form. They bring vividly before us the mighty dynasty that stood last in the old kingdom, giving place to the Hyksos, and the last dynasty that ruled in Egypt before it was swallowed up in the Roman Empire.

GREAT BRITAIN.

WE can make no communications from England of greater interest than that a second volume of Bunsen's "Egypt's place in Universal History" is announced by Longman. It is translated from the second and third volumes of the German edition. The author is preparing a new edition of his Hippolytus. It is to be corrected, remodelled, and considerably extended. There are to be in the new edition six volumes. The work is to be thus subdivided: Part 1 (2 vols.) is entitled Hippolytus and his Age, — the Beginnings and Prospects of Christianity. Part 2 (3 vols.) Hippolytus and his Age, — the documents. These are "Analecta Ante-Nicaena," "Canones et Constitutiones Apostolorum," and "Reliquiae liturgicae." Part 3 (1 vol.) is to be a "Sketch of the Philosophy of Language and Religion, — the Beginnings and Prospects of the human race." This last part will attract special attention. From its nature, it will develop fully the author's views of the Mosaic account of the origin and early history of the race. No German author can claim of the English public so candid and earnest a hearing as Bunsen. He is aware of his advantage, and will do what he can to commend a more liberal philosophy of history and of Biblical interpretation than has prevailed in England. We shall wait with great interest to see the book and its results.

Another of the fruits of the impulse given by the first edition of Bunsen's work is "Hippolytus and the Christian Church at the commencement of the third century," by W. Elfe Taylor.

Sir J. G. Wilkinson, as an abridgment of his larger work on Egypt, has prepared a "Popular Account of Ancient Egypt."

B. A. Irving has published a work entitled "Egypt and the Bible — the influence on the Hebrews of their residence in Egypt."

Niebuhr's Lectures on Ancient Ethnography and Geography have been translated by Dr. L. Schnitz. They treat of Greece and her colonies, Italy, the Islands of the Mediterranean, Spain, Gaul, Britain, Northern Africa and Phoenicia. They are published by Little, Brown and Co. in this country.

There is a work in preparation by George Smith, F. A. S., on the history and religion of the Gentile nations that were placed in proximity to the Jewish people, — the Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes, Persians, Greeks and Romans.

Rev. Charles Forster announces "The third part of the one primeval language," discussing the monuments of Assyria, Babylonia and Persia, and giving, as he thinks, a key to the recovery of the lost ten tribes.

Mr. S. Birch has prepared a *History of Ancient Pottery, Egyptian, Asiatic, Greek, Roman, Etruscan, and Celtic.*

The last volume of Bohn's *Antiq. Library* is Vol. I. of O. Vitalis's *Ecclesiastical History of England.*

There is announced from an unknown author, a clergyman of the Church of England, a *History of the various denominations of the Christian world*, and from H. H. Milman, a *History of Latin Christianity*, including that of the popes down to the time of Nicholas V. Three volumes have appeared. Two more complete the work.

Rev. C. Hardwick has published a *History of the Christian Church from the seventh century to the time of the Reformation.*

An interesting work is announced from W. L. Alexander, D. D., entitled "*Christ and Christianity, a vindication of the truth of the Christian religion, grounded on the historical verity of the life of Christ.*"

As helps in the study of Hebrew, we find noticed Donaldson's *Comparative Hebrew Grammar*; Bythner's *Hebrew and Chaldee Grammar*; and a "*Second Hebrew Book*," edited by the late Rev. T. K. Arnold and H. Browne, containing the book of Genesis, with a Syntax, Vocabulary and Grammatical Commentary. Mr. Browne has also just published a *Manual of Hebrew Antiquities.*

A *Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians* is published, edited by Arthur P. Stanley, Dr. Arnold's biographer; and one on *Thessalonians, Galatians and Romans*, by B. Jowett, Fellow and Tutor of Baliol.

Prof. Eadie has prepared a copious *Commentary on Ephesians.*

Lord Arthur Henry has edited a work on the *Genealogies of our Lord*, comparing the genealogies of Matthew and Luke with each other, and both with the Old Testament.

From F. D. Maurice (author of *Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament*, and other valuable works), we see announced a volume of *Theological Essays*, a work on the *Philosophy of the Middle Ages*, and one on *Modern Philosophy.*

A volume of *Lectures on the History of Moral Philosophy*, by W. A. Butler, late Professor of Moral Philosophy at Dublin, is edited by W. N. Thompson, Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge.

J. F. Ferrier, Professor of Moral Philosophy at St. Andrew's, gives us the "*Theory of knowing and being — Institutes of Metaphysics.*"

From Morell we have a work on "*The philosophical tendencies of the age.*"

Among De Morgan's recent works is one on "*Formal Logic.*"

An "*Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*," and a similar "*Introduction to the Canonical Epistles*," are announced from B. F. Westcott.

Walton and Maberly have nearly ready a "*School History of Greece*," by Dr. William Smith, who is also preparing a new *Latin-English Dictionary.*

Blackwood has just published Vol. II. of Alison's "*History of Europe from the fall of Napoleon to the accession of Louis Napoleon.*"

Ruskin's "*Stones of Venice*" is completed by the publication of Vol. III.

Bentley publishes a "*History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Com-*

monwealth from the execution of Charles I. to the death of Cromwell," by Guizot.

As another of the results of De Saulcy's Expedition in Palestine, we have the Abbé Michon's "Religious Pilgrimage to the East." The Abbé accompanied the Expedition as botanist.

Callery and Yvan's History of the Insurrection in China has attracted much attention. The authors are Frenchmen, and have had ample opportunity to gather information.

There is in press a "Narrative of a Journey through Syria and Palestine in 1851-2," by Lient. Van de Velde of the Dutch Royal Navy.

Prof. Creasy, author of "Fifteen decisive Battles," has written a sketch of the rise and progress of the English Constitution.

Finlay's History of the Byzantine Empire during the period A. D. 716—1057, is announced.

Baillière's "Ethnographical Library" is to consist of a series of monographs by distinguished ethnographers. Vol. I. is published, containing "Native Races of the Indian Archipelago—Papuan," by George W. Earl.

A History of the Protestant Church of Hungary, compiled from authentic documents, with a Preface by Dr. Merle D'Aubigne, is soon to be published.

UNITED STATES.

A VERY interesting work is soon to be published in Philadelphia, entitled "Types of Mankind, or Ethnological researches, based upon ancient monuments, sculptures, paintings, crania of races, and upon their natural, geographical, philological and biblical history." The editors are J. C. Nott, M. D. of Mobile, and G. R. Gliddon, formerly Consul at Alexandria. Valuable material is furnished by the papers of the late Dr. S. G. Morton. The work is to contain contributions by Prof. Agassiz and Wm. Usher, M. D.

Messrs. Blanchard and Lea of Philadelphia have published a new edition (the third) of "Physical Geography," by Mary Somerville, from the third revised London edition. The value of the American edition is also increased by "Notes and a Glossary," by W. S. W. Ruschenberger, M. D., U. S. Navy. This is a work of the highest authority, on a subject of great importance, until recently almost entirely neglected. It should be studied in connection with the common political geography, that the student may understand something of the structure of the globe, externally and internally, its general conformation, and the effects of it upon the human race, climate, vegetation, etc.

A new edition of Colton's Greek Reader is now nearly ready for publication, edited by Henry M. Colton, a brother of the author. It is to be thoroughly revised with foot-references, in the Formative part of Grammar, to Sophocles's Grammar, and in Syntax to Sophocles, and Crosby.

Messrs. Gould and Lincoln of Boston have in press, and will publish about the first of January, the Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases. Classified and Arranged so as to facilitate the Expression of Ideas, and assist in Literary Composition. By Peter Mark Roget, M. D., author of the "Bridge-

water Treatise on the Animal and Vegetable Kingdom." A new edition, revised and enlarged, by Prof. Barnas Sears, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, assisted by several Literary Gentlemen. 1 vol. 12mo. In the preparation of this American edition, Dr. Sears has made some important alterations. "The greatest fault," he says of the English work, "is that of incorporating so many objectionable words and phrases which ought never to meet the eye or tempt the tongue. Judged from his own point of view, the author must be pronounced successful in the execution of his design; but the design itself is faulty from its superfluity, embracing, as it does, words that had better be suppressed. Indeed, it is not easy to discover any advantage arising from so copious a collection of vulgar words and phrases, except to the few who, as professed authors, have frequent occasion to represent the language of low life, whom we do not undertake to aid. It was, therefore, thought advisable, in issuing an American edition, to omit all words of this character; and, as the greater part of the phrases are either low or trivial, and as the residue are of doubtful utility, they have all been dropped. Only those complex terms have been retained, which are frequently employed in the place of single words. Of the large number of unusual words, borrowed mostly from the Latin, and unknown to our purest and best writers, only a few, and such as are without any equivalents in the language, have been allowed a place in the present edition. The purely foreign words which intermingled with the English throughout the work, have been placed at the end and defined." "In the preparation of the edition now offered to the public, the editor has received important assistance from William Russell, Esq., Principal of the Normal Institute, at Lancaster, and Professor S. S. Greene, Superintendent of the Public Schools of Providence, R. I. The former with pencil in hand, carefully examined the whole work twice; the latter went through it once in the same way. As there is no absolute standard by which one can pass judgment upon words with reference to their admission into such a collection as this, it is to be expected that different persons, influenced by their individual tastes and associations, will judge differently. Whether the editor and his literary advisers have always judged wisely in this respect, it is not their province to decide. In the nice matter of drawing a line of distinction between vulgarisms and what is merely familiar and common, and between words resting on no good authority, and those that are only unusual or scientific, or of but recent currency, it is hoped that the united opinion of three individuals of different pursuits and mental habits, will diminish the chances of any great deviations from the right course." It is needless for us to express our opinion of Roget's admirable Thesaurus. We gave a brief recommendation of it in No. 40, pp. 838, 839 of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

Gould and Lincoln will also publish, as early as the first of March, the following scientific works: *Annual of Scientific Discovery for 1854*; or *Year Book of Facts in Science and Art*. Exhibiting the most important Discoveries and Improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Meteorology, Zoölogy, Botany, Mineralogy,

Geology, Geography, Antiquities, etc.; together with a list of recent Scientific Publications, a classified list of Patents, Obituaries of eminent Scientific Men, an Index of Important Papers in Scientific Journals, Reports, etc. Edited by David A. Wells, A. M. With a Likeness of Edward Hitchcock, LL. D., President of Amherst College. 12mo.

Comparative Anatomy of the Animal Kingdom. By Prof. C. Th. Von Siebold and Stannius. Translated from the German, and Edited with Notes and Additions, recording the recent progress of the science, by Waldo L. Burnett, M. D., Boston. Two vols. 8vo. Vol. I. Anatomy of the Invertebrata.

The following religious works are likewise in process of publication by Gould and Lincoln: *First Lines of Christian Theology*; in the Form of a Syllabus, prepared for the use of students. By Rev. John Pye Smith. Edited by Rev. W. Farley. 1 vol. 8vo.

Glad Tidings; or, The Gospel of Peace. A Series of Daily Meditations for Christian Disciples. By Rev. W. R. Tweedie, D. D. 16mo.

The Mission of the Comforter. With copious Notes. By Julius Charles Hare. With the Notes translated by an American editor. 12mo.

Among the works which have recently been published by the house of Gould and Lincoln, is the following, entitled: *Noah and his Times*; embracing the Considerations of various inquiries relative to the Antediluvian and earlier Postdiluvian Periods; with Discussions of several of the leading questions of the present day. By the Rev. J. Munson Olmsted, M. A. pp. 418. 12mo. The volume is well fitted for popular use.

Our readers are aware, that several months since, Gould and Lincoln published a work which is written with great power, and has been received with great favor, entitled: *The Preacher and the King*; or, Bourdaloue in the Court of Louis XIV.; being an Account of the Pulpit Eloquence of that Distinguished Era. Translated from the French of L. Bungener, Paris, twelfth edition. With an Introduction by the Rev. George Potts, D. D., Pastor of the University Place Presbyterian Church, New York. 12mo. pp. 338. More recently, they have published another work from the same author, entitled: *The Priest and the Huguenot*; or, Persecution in the Age of Louis XV. Part I. A Sermon at Court. Part II. A Sermon in the City. Part III. A Sermon in the Desert. In 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 408 and 480. This last named work, as well as the first, is written with rare vivacity, and is fitted to attract general interest.

Little, Brown and Co., of Boston, are now engaged in publishing a complete edition of the English Poets, edited by Prof. F. J. Child of Harvard College. The size and style of the volumes will be those of Pickering's Aldine Poets. The typography of those already published is beautiful. Few English books are more charming to the eye. This enterprise of Little and Brown is an honor to the American press. The Collection will be published in about a hundred and twenty volumes, and will include all that is of greatest value in the whole range of English Poetry, from Chaucer to Wordsworth. Particular care will be given to the republication of Chaucer and the English and Scotch Ballad Poetry; and every needful aid in the

form of biographical, historical or critical notices, glossaries, etc., will be given to the reader. The whole series of volumes will be enriched by valuable notes from the pen of Prof. Child. We do not know any other edition of the English Poets, which combines so many excellences. Each separate work may be purchased by itself, and the price of a single volume is seventy-five cents. The following are now ready: Butler, 2 vols.; Collins, 1 vol.; Cowper, 3 vols.; Dryden, 5 vols.; Goldsmith, 1 vol.; Gray, 1 vol.; Milton, 3 vols.; Parnell, 1 vol.; Pope, 3 vols.; Prior, 2 vols.; Thomson, 2 vols.; Swift, 3 vols.

It is known to our readers that Little, Brown and Co. are engaged extensively in the publication of English works in connection with mercantile houses in Great Britain. Among the books soon to be sent forth from their press are Hume's *Essays and Philosophical Works*; *Plutarch's Lives*; The Translation called *Dryden's, Corrected from the Greek and Revised by A. H. Clough*, sometime Fellow and Tutor of Ariel College, Oxford, and late Professor of English Language and Literature at University College, London. Both of these works are in large octavo and are exquisite specimens of typography, in the style of *Horner's Memoirs*, noticed in another part of this No. The *Life and Adventures of the renowned Don Quixote de la Mancha*; *Junius Discovered*, by Frederic Griffin; *Lyell's Manual of Geology*, and also his *Principles of Geology*; *Jeremy Taylor's Whole Works*, in ten vols. octavo; *Lord John Russell's Memoirs of Thomas Moore*, in eight vols. octavo; *Lord Mahon's History of England* in seven vols. octavo, form a part of this series of works, some of which are already published and the remainder may be soon expected.

Little, Brown and Co. are also publishing Prof. Pierce's *Analytical Mechanics*, which will form an admirable quarto volume of about 600 pages.

An interesting volume has been published recently by T. R. Marvin and S. K. Whipple and Co. of Boston, entitled: *Memoirs of John Codman, D. D.*, by William Allen, D. D., late President of Bowdoin College, with *Reminiscences* by Joshua Bates, D. D., late President of Middlebury College. To these *Biographical Sketches*, are added six sermons of Dr. Codman. The whole volume contains 408 octavo pages. It is a valuable work, not merely as perpetuating the memory of a judicious pastor, but also as illustrating the *Ecclesiastical History of New England*.

There is another work, which ought to have been previously noticed in our Review, as a valuable contribution to Ecclesiastical literature. It is a volume exhibiting much research, and explaining many customs and terms not generally understood. For a book of definitions it is uncommonly interesting. It is entitled: *A Dictionary of Congregational Usages and Principles according to Ancient and Modern Authors*; to which are added *Brief Notices of some of the Principal Writers, Assemblies and Treatises referred to in the Compilation*. By Rev. Preston Cummings. pp. 432. 12mo. A third edition of this work has been recently published by S. K. Whipple and Co. of Boston. It is singular that a work of this kind had never been published before.

CONTENTS OF NO. XLII.

Article.	Page.
I. HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY AND ETHNOGRAPHY, 217	
Translated from Rougemont's <i>Essai d'une Géographie de l'Homme</i> , by E. C. Tracy, Windsor, Vt.	
1. Man and Nature,	217
2. Man in his Idea,	221
3. Man Fallen,	222
4. Origin of Races,	225
5. Gradual Degeneration of Man and Nature,	226
6. Providential Movements in Ages immediately subsequent to the Deluge,	227
7. Location of Race,	230
8. The Shemites,	236
9. Japhethites,	239
10. Hamites,	244
11. The Nations as a Whole,	245
12. History,	246
13. Redemption,	249
II. GOD'S POSITIVE MORAL GOVERNMENT OVER MORAL AGENTS, ADDITIONAL TO THAT WHICH IS MERELY NATURAL, 254	
By Rev. Samuel D. Cochran, Paterson, N. J.	
III. THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, AND THE REASONS FOR THEIR EXCLUSION FROM THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE, 278	
By C. E. Stowe, D. D., Professor at Andover.	
I. The Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament,	278
II. Debates and Decisions in the Council of Trent,	280

III. These Books never had the Sanction of Christ or of his Apostles, or of any of the Writers of the New Testament,	292
IV. These Books formed no part of the original Hebrew Canon, and were not written till after Inspiration had ceased and the Canon was closed,	293
V. These Books were rejected with singular unanimity by the Early Christian Churches and the best of the Church Fathers,	295
IV. THE RELATION OF DAVID'S FAMILY TO THE MESSIAH, 306	
By E. P. Barrows, Jr., Professor at Andover.	
V. EXCURSION TO THE LAKES EAST OF DAMASCUS,	329
By Rev. J. L. Porter, Missionary at Damascus.	
EXCURSION TO KESWEH,	342
VI. THE NATURE AND INFLUENCE OF THE HISTORIC SPIRIT,	345
An Inaugural Discourse, by William G. T. Shedd, Professor at Andover.	
VII. CHAUCER AND HIS TIMES,	394
By M. P. Case, M. A., Newburyport, Mass.	
VIII. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,	417
I. Dr. Cannon's Pastoral Theology,	417
By Rev. C. Van Santvoord, Saugerties, N. Y.	
IX. SELECT THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE, 429	
Great Britain,	429

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA,
NO. XLII.
AND
AMERICAN BIBLICAL REPOSITORY,
NO. XCIV.

APRIL, 1854.

ARTICLE I.

HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY AND ETHNOGRAPHY.

Translated from Rougemont's *Essai d'une Géographie de l'Homme*,¹
by E. C. Tracy, Windsor, Vt.

1. *Man and Nature.*

WE have all a feeling, more or less distinct, that nature has great influence upon us. It seems to us that her action is adverse to our liberty, and oftener prejudicial to us than for our advantage. Under the influence of an instinctive fear that she excites, we shrink from a thorough examination of the relations that exist between her and man. We feel that we cannot too much enlarge the interval which separates rational from irrational existence; and are impelled to believe that the best thing for us is, to withdraw ourselves from every physical influence as much as possible. Yet the study of history, the study of nature, and the study of man, all lead us, though by different paths, to the consideration of this delicate subject. Multiplied investigations

¹ The *Précis d'Ethnographie, de Statistique, et de Géographie Historique, un Essai d'une Géographie de l'Homme*, by Professor Fréd. de Rougemont, was published at Neufchatel, Switzerland, in 1838, in 2 vols. 12mo. This Article is the *Introduction* to that work, in which the author gives a rapid outline of his views of Historical Geography and Ethnography. The author is a pupil of Ritter, whose method he has aimed, in his lectures and by the publication of several geographical works, to introduce into the schools of Switzerland.

have led to the conclusion that the influence of nature is even far greater than has been generally supposed; and, by a secret tendency towards materialism, the greater number of men of science have shut their eyes to all those facts which establish the superiority of man, and have given prominence, on the other hand, to such as prove his dependence; they have narrowed down more and more the sphere in which man is free, and have ended by declaring that the soul is the slave of the body — that there is no soul. Historical geography, then, the object of which is to investigate the influence of countries upon nations, is certainly one of the most perilous domains of science; and he that trusts himself there, without the Christian faith for his guide, is likely to go astray.

Our understanding is naturally either too limited or too blind to grasp, at once, the opposite extremes of truth, or to avoid continually sacrificing the soul to the body, or the body to the soul, spirit to matter, or matter to spirit, the infinite to the finite, or the finite to the infinite. Christianity alone, overthrowing, at once, the degrading falsehoods of materialism and the noble errors of the idealists, proclaims to the world realism and its mysteries. The "unknown God" whom it reveals, is God become man. It teaches that man receives into his heart the spirit of God, which renews and sanctifies the body as well as the soul; that, when time shall be no longer, the soul shall again dwell in its human body, and man, risen from the grave, shall be forever man; that the earth participates in all the fortunes of our race; that faith hath the promises of the life that now is as well as those of the life that is to come; and, even as under the Mosaic dispensation the kingdom of God was a nation among other nations, so the time will doubtless come, when believers under the new covenant shall be united as one people, and constitute together one nation.

The Christian alone can follow out to their last results the various influences of nature upon man, without exposing himself to dangerous error in regard to his personal accountability, and even the existence of the soul; and, on the other hand, he only is able to contemplate man in his union with God, and yet not be drawn to overlook his relations with nature. Frankly and without any materialistic afterthought, he represents each nation as bearing, in its character and its history, the imprint of the country it inhabits; for he knows that every man bears, in the

centre of his being, the indestructible image of God; an image over which nature has no other power than to influence the forms of its outward manifestation. Three principles, equally simple and certain, guide him in all his researches, viz. that terrestrial nature was created with reference to man, and exercises upon nations an influence determined by the will of God; that man, who by his spirit is in a real communion with God and thus infinitely superior to every being destitute of reason, is incapable, nevertheless, of living elsewhere than on the earth, and was formed to develop himself under the salutary influences of nature; and that sin, which does not come from God, has polluted man and disturbed nature, and so altered their relations to each other that they have become in many cases injurious to man.

The author of this work has a deep conviction that the Christian faith alone furnishes the solution of all the enigmas presented by physical and historical science. But, in the progress of his work, sometimes like a blind man just recovering the power of vision, he has been able to gain but a confused glimpse of objects illuminated by the sun of everlasting truth; sometimes he has feared lest he should mistake some poor glimmer of his own fancy for a ray of the true light, and thus dishonor by his errors the Divine Master who hath taken him into his service; and, finally, it sometimes has seemed to him that the unbelief of the age compelled him to silence. Therefore, to supply, to some extent, what is wanting in this respect in the body of the work, he has aimed, in an Introduction, to present some general views on nature and humanity; not that he undertakes by any means to discuss fundamentally the important subjects which come up; his object rather is simply to place his readers in what he believes to be the true point of view.¹

Let the Bible, therefore, be our guide in the field of science, as it is our light in the path of life.

The earth, like the heavens, is a manifestation of the invisible

¹ True according to both science and revelation; for truth is one. Faith is the judge of profane and the guide of Christian science. Science confirms faith, and finds, out of the domains of religion and in those of science and of history, the products and the proofs of revealed truth. Faith and science are sisters; they have for their object the works of the same Deity, the twofold revelation of the same invisible Being; they cannot contradict one another; if ever they apparently do it, it must be either that science but poorly comprehends what is written in nature, history and man, or that faith has failed to hear with due attention the word of God.

perfections of God; and, as it is the work of One who is Wisdom, Power and Love, and is from a Fountain of light in which there is no darkness at all, it rises into being answering in all points to the idea after which it is created; there cannot be in it the smallest fault; it is worthy of God in the infinite intelligence which it reveals, worthy of him in the unalloyed happiness enjoyed by all created beings of which it is the home. It glorifies its Creator by whom and for whom are all things (Rom. 11: 36). Such is the earth in its idea; such was the earth as it came from the Creator's hand. But in our time it speaks of suffering and degradation, not less than of glory and of bliss.

God fully manifests himself only in beings who act freely and with complete self-consciousness, and to whom he can communicate his own life. Irrational creatures are subjected to those endowed with reason; the kingdom of nature and necessity, to that of freedom and conscience. But the two are complements of each other, and constitute but a single whole.

The elements, plants, animals, and man, are but different parts of one and the same created work, the name of which is The Earth; but organs of one and the same body. They mutually suppose the existence of each other, and their destinies are inseparable.

They were created progressively in the order of their relative perfection; the elements and the crystal, which has only the principle of organization, preceded vegetables, which have also the principle of development; and these again were followed by animals, which have the power of self-motion and are endowed with sensation. These the earth itself produced at the creative command of God. From one epoch to another it gave being to existences less material, and endowed with a higher power of life, and it seemed, as it were, to be aspiring towards the production of an intelligent and spiritual being, whose abode it should become; it labored to give birth (*nascitura, natura*) to man. But it was not from its bosom that its lord must come forth; it could do no more than furnish the material for the human body, which the Lord made after his own image and animated by his own spirit. Thus man was formed by an immediate act of God; but none the less is he a continuation of the progressive steps followed in the creation of the earth, and of which he is the highest.¹

¹ Vide Steffens, *Anthropologie*.

2. Man in his Idea.

Man is composed of body, soul, and spirit.¹ His bodily form gives him rank as the first of animals; for the idea of animal organization, which expresses itself in forms less and less imperfect from the polypus to the monkey, is adequately realized only in man. Of all animals he only walks erect, while his eye reflects earth and sky at once, and his look glances freely over that nature in the midst of which he lives and reigns. His hands are so curiously made that materialists have sought in them the only cause of his intellectual superiority; and over his whole form there is an air of more than material beauty; the reflection of a soul infinitely rich in thought and emotion. Whatever passes within him is uttered, not by inarticulate cries, but in words. His soul renders man self-conscious, free and accountable; by it he lives, not for himself alone, but also for others; he possesses inventive genius, the sense of beauty, and the power to reproduce beauty in various forms; he has the desire to understand and the power to investigate everything. By his spirit, finally, man is in real communion with God, who dwells in him; the life eternal diffuses itself in the soul, where it sheds abroad a Divine love; it descends into the body, which is the temple of the Holy Ghost, and which is not subject to death. Man is a complex being, a summing-up of all earthly nature. In common with the crystal he has organized existence; with the plant, vegetable life; and with the animal, a body and the rudiments of a soul. But by his spirit he is raised infinitely above all nature; and an impassable gulf separates him from the most perfect of mere animals.

After birth, man develops himself according to the immutable laws of his threefold nature, and, at the same time, according to the use that he makes of his liberty. By a regular and progressive movement, which it cannot be that death shall suddenly and permanently interrupt, he advances towards that perfection which is his right and duty. Yet, as he is but part of the great whole, and as his existence is interwoven with all other existences, his development takes place in the midst of creatures and things whose influences upon him are diverse, and under

¹ See Schubert, *Geschichte d. Seele*.

the threefold agency of nature, of other men, and of God.¹ By virtue of the image of God which he bears, he is lord of irrational nature; elements, plants, animals, are his servants, and do his will while that will is conformed to the laws of their being; by the soil, he is sustained and nourished; water quenches his thirst, the air enables him to breathe; all nature is employed in satisfying his wants, in developing the faculties of his soul, and, by speaking to him unceasingly of God, in strengthening the religious life in his spirit. He is the equal of his fellow men, with whom he is connected by the ties of love, and his faculties can be perfectly developed only in the bosom of the family, and in legitimate social and political relations. In infancy and childhood he grows up under the moral influence of parents who watch over and guide him; as a husband, he finds in the love and the life of woman what was wanting to the perfection of his own separate understanding and working; and he passes his life in the quickening atmosphere of affection, virtue, truth, and piety. He is the servant of God; but the believing and rejoicing servant of a God of love, who formed him after his own image; and so the spirit has its atmosphere, which the Sun of Righteousness warms and enlightens, and in which man lives by faith.

Such is man in his idea; such he was before the fall, such he will one day again become.

3. *Man Fallen.*

The first man sinned, and the very source of our life became poisoned.

By sin man lost his union with God; and, as a plant which has its light, warmth and life only from the sun, and yet should wander out into void space far from its true orbit, and lose itself in icy darkness, his spiritual eye is darkened so that he can no longer see God, his soul has become enfeebled, and his spiritual death has brought on the death of the body. Man has become his own centre, his own sun; he refers everything to himself; he has broken, by self-seeking, the cords of love that should bind him to the rest of the world; and, as he no longer receives spiritual strength and support from God, he has so corrupted himself

¹ See Heinroth, *Anthropologie*, 2nd part; and Görres, *Gliederung und Zeitfolge der Weltgeschichte*.

as to have become incapable, without help, of any good thing. This being, who bears the image of God, and in whom God would perfect that Divine likeness, having in his pride sought, by making himself independent, to become equal with God, has, instead, become self-enslaved; he has in his heart a master — sin — by whom his legitimate sovereign was dethroned; and his servitude is so much the more deplorable and bitter because he still retains, in a certain degree, a consciousness of moral obligation that he struggles in vain to fulfil, and a desire of happiness that he cannot attain.

By sin, man has come to a painful knowledge of the holiness and justice of God, which are as far beyond our comprehension as his love. He feels that the Lord is angry with him, and that the wages of sin is death. He looks around him for a life to be sacrificed instead of his own, and deluges the altars he erects with the blood of slain beasts, and sometimes even with that of a brother man or a child. Or, on the other hand, he hardens his heart; he says to himself, that sin is an imperfection inherent in his nature; he stifles the voice of conscience, and forgets both his Heavenly Father who still loves him, and his Judge who must one day condemn him.

Man becomes the tyrant or the slave of man; he finds in those around him the same hatred or coldness, the same vices or mere show of virtues, the same ignorance or falsehood, the same impiety or forgetfulness of God, which he carries in his own bosom.

His dominion over all created things he has lost; beasts of the earth fear (Gen. 4: 2) but are not subject to him (Gen. 1: 28), with the exception of a few species which he has appropriated, and which minister to his wants. Nature finds in him no longer anything but an enemy who torments her, a heedless creature who despises her admonitions, or a slave whom she oppresses. She is not, as Zoroaster and Manes taught, the joint work of a good and an evil Principle; she is pure as the God who created her. If she acts injuriously upon man, it is because man has lost that Divine life which assured to him dominion over all the earth; it is because there burn within him lawless desires that change the most healthful fruits into poisons; the riches of nature become food for his various passions, and he goes about to worship her as if she were herself the God of whom she is but a revelation.

Besides, man hath drawn down with him in his fall that nature which was appointed to surround him with its pomp and glory; the evil that has found place in his soul affects also the earth, and the earth is cursed for his sake. The primitive order has, therefore, been disturbed even in the sphere of physical cause and effect; nature has received, that she may execute, the Divine judgments, a destructive power that was not hers before sin came; in some regions she is enchained by eternal frosts, in others, sterile from dryness and heat, and in others still, perhaps, gigantic in her productions through the very excess of fertility. Had man retained his primitive condition, physical evil would have been as if it were not, for to the pure all things are pure; but man having fallen, nature has rendered his fall still more desperate and made his sin still more sin, by exercising over him an influence not only very great, but dangerous, sad, deadly.

Evil, as it cannot proceed from a holy God, is necessarily the work of created beings, and theirs only. It existed before man; and Adam was tempted from without. To the temptation urged by the very author of evil, the father of lies, he yielded. So also it is only by means out of himself that he may be delivered from sin, into which weakness, still more than evil propensity, originally caused him to fall. We arrive here at a truth, the reality of which no unbelief of ours can affect; we say that man, in quitting the realm of light, entered that of darkness; that, in excluding God from his soul, he opened it to the devil; and that nature and humanity became subject together to the prince of this world.

What, O God, had been the fate of the earth, if with thy mighty hand thou hadst not traced for evil bounds that it could not pass, and if in thine ineffable love thou hadst not sent thy Son into the world to destroy the works of the devil! Evil might pollute, but could not annihilate, a creature of God; might cause perturbations in the universe, but the primitive order it could not destroy. On the contrary, God causes it entirely to disappear where men, by a strange madness and in their permitted freedom, do not oppose themselves directly to his will. His wisdom is able to educe good out of evil, a greater good than would have had place but for the existence of sin; sin notwithstanding, and even by reason of its existence, the earth moves on towards a consummation of infinitely higher glory than that of its original purity and beauty.

4. *Origin of Races.*

In Adam was the germ of the whole human family, and from him, after a hundred and fifty generations, have descended the eight or nine millions of men who now dwell on the earth. But in all ages and in all regions, the innumerable dwellers on our planet have had each his own proper individuality, which has never been an exact repetition of any other.

Individuality is a certain combination of the constituent parts of a being. Man is an exceedingly complex being, and embraces within himself a world of invisible things that rivals in various riches the world of nature. The elements that belong to him may, therefore, be combined in the individual, in infinitely varied proportions. In one, the soul predominates; in another, the body; in a third, the spirit; here, it is the nervous system that rules; there, the arterial; here, the affections; there, the understanding; and so on.

In the first man these elements must necessarily have existed in perfect equilibrium; among his descendants they are developed variously. But the laws and the causes that determine the peculiar combinations that are found in this and that individual, are unknown to us; for individuality is a mystery of life, and act of creation.

The soul, in our conceptions at least, if not actually in time, precedes the body, which is its visible form, even as God precedes the material universe that he hath created. As is the soul, so is the body; and the distinctive character of each soul manifests itself in the whole physical organization, especially in the form of the head, and in the physiognomy. The infinite diversity of forms found among human beings is, therefore, a result of that individuality which is a fact in morals as well as in physics.

The influence of nature, that of the family and of society, and that which each exercises over himself by his manners and habits, are but of secondary importance, and can only strengthen, enfeeble or modify the original fact of a given individuality. Yet by constant and unvarying repetition through a long series of generations, very evident changes may be brought about.

Meantime sin, in its work of disturbance, exaggerates or destroys individual differences. Sometimes an excessive predominance is given to this or that faculty, so that it overshadows

all the others; sometimes, assimilating man to the brute, it gives to all the individuals of a race a physiognomy that varies but little. But above all, it destroys the proper supremacy of the soul over the body, develops unworthy passions, and tends to efface, from body and soul alike, the image of God in man, who, in his brutishness, descends lower than animals destitute of reason. Now, as every disposition of the soul manifests itself in the body, it results that the human race embraces families, and the same nation, individuals, who differ exceedingly in personal appearance, and among whom some are as remarkable for beauty as others are for ugliness.

5. Gradual Degeneration of Man and Nature.

Sin by no means produced all its physical effects immediately after the fall. Nature, whose root the destroying worm had, indeed, attacked, still retained numerous traces of her original beauty. It was only after continuing eight or nine hundred years that the onset made by death upon a being naturally immortal, ended in separating the soul from the body. And with this extraordinary vital power in man, there were doubtless faculties of corresponding vigor and energy, such as it is now difficult for us to conceive. But all these privileges enjoyed by the antediluvians beyond what we possess, did but hasten their moral ruin.

They were divided, according to family relationships and to the spirit which animated them respectively, into Sethites, who worshipped God, and Cainites, who were abandoned to magic and to all evil. The Sethites, it is believed, invented the art of writing and cultivated astronomy; the Cainites built cities or dwelt in tents, giving themselves up in both to the luxuries and indulgences of civilized life. They formed but one people, all spake the same language, and were not organized into different states and nations; so that sin was not kept within bounds by the strong arm of civil law, nor its propagation hindered by differences of language. God, moreover, designing to convince man of the depth of his corruption, abandoned him apparently to himself; and the Saviour promised to Adam did not appear. The result was, that the Sethites were seduced from their purer worship and practice by the Cainites, and the whole world became filled with violence; the thoughts of the hearts of the

children of men were only evil continually; and God, by a deluge, destroyed the whole race with the exception of a single family which found favor in his sight by reason of the righteousness of its head.¹

When the human family began again to multiply, means entirely new were used by God to prevent man's wandering a second time from the path that leads to heaven. The curse that rested upon the earth and upon its lord, was fulfilled to its utmost physical results, but yet became in many respects a source of blessing to man. The surface of the continents took the form which it still retains. Mankind became divided into races, and were organized into nations; which were distributed over the earth's surface according to a definite plan, and to each of which was assigned its proper part in the progress of events. Everything, finally, was arranged with reference to the coming of the Son of God, who should destroy evil and restore all things.

At the epoch of the deluge the earth underwent immense changes, of which traces are found in pagan tradition, which revelation intimates to us, and the details of which science will in due time clearly demonstrate. A revolution took place in the atmosphere. To the mist which spread itself over the whole earth and moistened the soil,² succeeded clouds with fertilizing rains, and with the rainbow, symbol of the covenant; but also with hail, snow, whirlwinds, tempests, tornados and inundations.

6. *Providential Movements in Ages immediately subsequent to the Deluge.*

Surely the vine was not the only new vegetable then brought into being; and God concentrated in a small number of animals and vegetables, which are the power of the enemy (Luke 10: 19), various poisons, none of which, certainly, existed before the fall. Soon there must also have come into being, called by Divine power, those legions of insects that live only on corruption. Placed in circumstances less and less favorable to life, man lost by degrees his vigor; the number of his years on earth rapidly declined; and to maintain his strength, by the command of God

¹ Bossuet, *Histoire Universelle*, second part, chapter 1. Bräm, *Blicke in die Weltgeschichte*, Strasbourg, 1835, pp. 84—125; Kaiser, *Commentarius in priora Genesis capita, quatenus universae populorum mythologiae claves exhibent*, Norimbergae, 1829, pp. 71—185

² Gen. 2: 6.

he added to the vegetable substances that had hitherto nourished him, the flesh of animals. A similar change doubtless took place at the same time among animals, which were created herbivorous (Gen. 1: 30), for their lot is intimately allied with that of man.¹

The surface of the earth itself appears to have undergone immense changes. But we here enter upon a domain entirely hypothetical, where we have nothing to guide us but the analogy of faith and our imperfect views of the plan after which God has ordered the history of our race. It is probable that the sandy deserts which occupy immense regions of Africa, Asia and America, were made by the waters of the deluge. At the same time the earth seems to have become cooler, and its surface, hardened in the process, has been ever since tormented continually by internal fires, which occasion, in our age of the world, earthquakes and volcanos unknown to the antediluvian period. The plutonic forces being shut up under a hard and solid crust, mountains and plains already existing were raised to their present elevation; and thus was formed the relief of the terrestrial surface that now exists, and physical regions, before indistinctly marked and little differing from each other, received their precise limits and special characteristics. God had decreed that the human family in its new development should not constitute a single nation, but should be divided into a large number of distinct races; and the earth, under the very waters of the deluge, prepared itself for the execution of his will.

These races must of course descend from the three sons of Noah; and when, in the light of faith, we examine their characteristics, and what the Bible tells us of these three ancestors, we are led to believe that spiritual and religious tendencies predominated in Shem; in Japheth the intellectual; and the corporeal and physical in Ham.² Antediluvian humanity had but two divisions, that of Seth, or faith; and that of Cain, or sin; and civilization was developed simultaneously in both. With the deluge, therefore, history recommences upon an entirely different plan;³ civilization was entrusted to particular races (the Japhetic), in order that it might not divert from Divine things the

¹ See Schubert, *Symbolique*, ch. 3, and *The Primitive World and the Fixed Stars* (Urwelt and Fixsterne).

² Capadoc, *Despotism considered as the natural development of the liberal system*, Amsterdam, 1830, p. 37.

³ The manifold (πολυποίκιλος) wisdom of God. Eph. 3: 10.

Shemites whose God is the Lord (Gen. 9: 26), nor augment at once the corruption and the power of the race of Ham, which lay under a curse. But, although the treasure of Divine truth was to be especially confided to the children of Shem, and the descendants of Ham were to become eminently transgressors, it was nevertheless the Divine plan that the kingdom of God should pervade all nations, and that of evil in like manner embrace dwellers in every part of the earth.

For about a century, the descendants of the three sons of Noah dwelt together, and the whole inhabited earth was of the same language and of one speech (Gen. 11: 1). This primitive population embraced, as in a single bud, the germs of all future nations. The character of Japheth, that of Shem, and that of Ham, were transmitted, with modifications, to their respective descendants; and the moral and physical differences that characterized the three ancestors reappeared in the children, becoming greater and greater through the influences of depravity. In their pride, they undertook together the building of an immense structure, which they were unable to finish by reason of division and strife, and the confusion that arose in their language.

Language is the vocal expression of whatever is in the soul of man. If men had all lived the same life in God, an essential and fundamental unity would have overruled all their differences of temperament, character, feeling, and thought; and being all alike at the core, they would have had but one language. But this spiritual and Divine unity having been broken up, opportunity was given for the development of characters diverging in opposite directions, and in ways innumerable. That primitive society was rent to its foundations; it was dismembered genealogically into little tribes, which had each a marked and decided character of its own. These tribes became so many races, and characteristic differences, obscure before, became prominent and palpable, under the immediate hand of God, by the formation of different languages. Speech, which had been given to connect man with all his fellows, henceforth separated and estranged race from race. But sin found its own victory turned into partial defeat; for evil would have been propagated more rapidly over the earth if all its inhabitants had spoken the same language, and humanity would have gone undivided to destruction by the same road that it followed before the deluge.

Here, then, we see the human family divided into races, dif-

fering from each other in soul, body and language, which, no longer able to live together, began to spread themselves over the face of the whole earth (Acts 17: 26).

The earth is prepared for their reception; the great changes of its surface have been completed; the bounds of their habitation have been determined (*ibid.*), and each country has its peculiar character, which corresponds with some tendency of our nature, and manifests in a peculiar manner some perfection of God. If one of those men to whom God revealed his ways, had traversed the desert surface of our planet at this epoch, he might have read, in the permanent and mysterious forms of continents and tracts of earth, the general progress of nations and of the race. For the earth is a prophecy of history.

7. *Location of Races.*

But who shall guide the wandering steps of these primitive emigrants into the unknown countries towards which they hasten? Chance, it may be said. Chance! a word without meaning, which unbelief alone could invent, and which is no more to be found upon the lips of the believer than in the pages of Divine revelation! God, who numbereth the stars (Ps. 147: 4), numbereth also the hairs of our head (Luke 12: 7), and the same will, without which not a sparrow falleth to the ground (Matt. 10: 30), governs the fate of the mightiest empires. Does not the swallow know, at the approach of winter, whither she must resort? Does not the stork, without mistake, return, with the returning season, to the spot she left? How, then, shall the different races of men take by chance their respective dwelling-places on the earth's surface? The Lord, who created the earth by his power, and gave it unto whom it seemed meet unto him (Jer. 27: 5), will lead the children of men, whom he hath himself divided into distinct tribes, towards the regions that have been prepared for them (Deut. 32: 8—13).

God placed the descendants of Shem and of Japheth near each other; the most marked religious tendency side by side with the highest intellectual and social endowments. It was ordained that the former should remain near the regions occupied since the deluge. He "enlarged"¹ over the greater part of

¹ Gen. 9: 27. To extend, or gently to attract by the Gospel. Both senses are alike historically true.

the earth the numerous family of Japheth, which diffused itself towards the east, the north and the west, and divided the isles of the Gentiles.¹ The descendants of Ham, as if infected persons, from whom it was feared the contagion would spread, he sent into exile beyond the vast desert of Sahara, into a continent entirely isolated, to occupy a country where nature harmonizes with their sensual and self-indulgent disposition.

Then began, over the whole face of the earth, a work, respecting which man has preserved but vague traditions, and upon which Divine revelation is silent. This work was the formation of races; in regard to which human design and choice had nothing to do. It was the work of God, with nature to aid in the accomplishment of his plan. Each region strengthened and modified the character of the race with reference to which it had been created by God, and which he had led into it; and national characters, which became more and more marked and decided as generations succeeded each other, attained such a degree of fixedness and inflexibility, as has enabled them to traverse the ages of history and encounter the most opposite influences, without ever undergoing any radical change.² But let us not presume to penetrate, even with the united lights of faith and of science, the secrets of that era of creation, during which the spirit of God moved on the face of the earth and among the races that dwelt thereon; for to man every creative act is hid in darkness that he cannot penetrate.

But when the scene is unveiled before us, at our first view of the human family, we find the nations marked by such astonishing differences of aspect and character, that we ask ourselves, at once, what has become of the unity of the race? and we are ready to doubt whether any such unity ever existed. What! the Negroes and Mongols brothers of the Whites; the bloody Bosjesmans and

¹ Gen. 10: 5. This passage seems to indicate that the word *Gentiles* in the Bible means chiefly the descendants of Japheth, and that interpretation receives decided confirmation from history.

² This permanence of physical and moral characteristics is to be found in most families. The history of aristocratic republics, such as Rome or Berne, present astonishing instances of families whose members have been distinguished from age to age for the same virtues and the same faults. A more thorough study of this fact would undoubtedly throw some light on the origin of races. It proves that ancestral individuality descends in families from generation to generation, and remains, notwithstanding the various mingling of other blood by marriage.

the stupid Australians of the same parentage with the mild and peaceful German and the lively son of France?

The fact is, that, while God was accomplishing his designs, sin was also doing its work; and the poison which had insinuated itself into the roots of the great tree of humanity, became diffused with the sap through all its new branches and tainted all its fruits. But for sin, the different races, diverse yet alike, would have spoken a common language, varied by numerous dialects, and would alike have exhibited, in body and soul, the image of one and the same God. But for sin, the human family would have never reckoned among its members, persons so repulsive as the negro of Africa and Australia, the Hottentot, the Pecherai, the Botocudo, and the Samoyede.

Cast your eye over the community in the bosom of which you live, and you will find that, in the same atmosphere that you breathe yourself, on the same soil that supplies your own food, in families of the same race with your own, with the same education, and the same circumstances and manner of life, there are at your side men of abject souls and repulsive forms, men whose whole exterior proclaims the secret power of sin. Now the same influence that sin manifests over certain members of a community, it exerts in like manner upon whole tribes and races, as members of the great family of man. Most nations have carried into the countries that had been prepared for them, peculiar sinful tendencies, which have transformed into curses to themselves and to humanity at large, those talents with which they were especially endowed; and that nature in the bosom of which their life is passed, has developed their vices with all the energy that had been given it for the development of their virtues.

In the case of many races, therefore, the type of the human form, which must of course undergo some peculiar modification in each region of the earth, has been completely changed. This change has doubtless been effected slowly and through numerous transitions; and, in fact, we now find on earth, among existing tribes and communities, every step in the progress of this work of primitive times. The nations nearest the cradle of our race, show also the least departure from the white type; at a greater distance, in regions of an entirely different character from the country of the whites (Central Africa, Mongolia), are tribes (Negroes and Mongols) whose bodies have taken a very remark-

able form, because the soul is, as it were, mutilated and debased; and, finally, at the extremities of continents, at the greatest distance from the home of human life — the ancestral fireside of the race — are also tribes the most of all debased, alike in body and in soul.

The whites take possession of Western Asia and spread themselves over all Europe. South-west of the region where the dispersion began, are the Berbers, the Gallas, and the Caffres, which connect the Arabs and Abyssinians (whites) with the Negroes. In Central and Western Africa are the true Negroes, whose form degenerates, towards the southern extremity of the continent, through the Namaquas and the Hottentots, to the revolting figure of the Bosjesman.

Towards the north-east, the Turks constitute so natural a link between the Whites and the Mongols, that it is equally easy to class them with one or the other of these two races. The Mongol figure is most characteristically marked among the Mongols and Calmucks upon the elevated Plateau of Upper Asia. It grows ugly towards the north, among the Songares; and in the extreme boreal regions of the earth, among the Samoyedes, Lapps and Esquimaux, becomes dwarfish. On the south and south-east it assimilates, through the Chinese as a connecting link, with the Malays of Oceanica. The Hindûs have points of affinity with all the three alike, the Whites, the Mongols and the Malays; and the Thibetians complete the transition from the Whites (Hindûs) to the Mongols. The Slavonic race is half Turk, half German.

The Malays are connected at many points with the Oceanic negroes, who differ in many respects from the negroes of Africa, and constitute, like the Berbers, a connecting link between the white (Hindû) and the negro.

The American tribes are connected with the Mongols through the Onaks and other inhabitants of the north-west coast of the new world. But great obscurity still rests upon the ethnography of that continent.¹

The descendants of Shem preserved the original type of the human form comparatively unchanged. The children of Ham became negroes or half-negroes (Berbers, Gallas, Caffres); they were the earliest inhabitants of Arabia, and it is also to them,

¹ Upon the question of the unity of the human race, see the admirable pages of Steffens, in his *Anthropology*, Vol. II., towards the end.

perhaps, that we should trace the ancient negro population of India, and the negroes of the Indian Archipelago and of Australia. Of the descendants of Japheth, some have retained the primitive characteristics of form, and constitute, with the children of Shem, the white race. Such is the numerous nations at the east and north of the land of Shem, and occupying the immense zone of which the ocean and western Europe are the two extremities. Others have degenerated in soul and body, though not to so low a point as the negroes; they are the Mongol race, with which the Malays and the American Indians are related.¹

With these diversities of origin and physical constitution, the differences of language correspond, and the day is at hand when science itself will divide languages into three great classes. Already the dialects of the children of Shem are classed together as of the same family, and we seem on the point of discovering,² that the languages of the white Japhethites (the Indo-Germanic³) and those of their Mongol relatives, belong to one and the same class; with which also those of the Malays are allied. As to the American languages, their similarity in grammatical structure, and the entire dissimilarity of their roots, are equally surprising. The negro languages are still very imperfectly known.

However great may be the differences of form, character and language between different races of the human family, all men have, nevertheless, the same faculties and the same organs; and the fragments of a primitive language that are found scattered over the face of the earth, bear witness to their common origin, which is also attested by the agreement of historical tra-

¹ Another hypothesis makes the Americans Shemites instead of Japhethites. The origin of the Chinese is also very uncertain.

² As the manuscript of this Introduction is going to the press, I have received Xylander's *Sprachgeschichte der Titanen* (Frankfort am Maine, 1837), who has strengthened my convictions and furnished unexpected support to this hypothesis. He has made, he himself remarks, but a rapid excursion into a region very little known, and yet he has discovered numerous and striking points of similarity among different Mongol languages, and between these same languages and the Greek; "the Mandchou is a primitive Greek dialect." (p. 197). Even the Chinese is apparently akin, not only to the Mongol and Mandchou, but to the Greek, both in its roots and its grammar, etc. "The Shemitic languages have, doubtless, more than one point of contact with those of the Titans (the Japhetic), but these resemblances are so few as apparently to indicate that the Shemites became separated from the Titans at a very remote period." (p. 419). Herodotus relates that the Scythians were the ancestors of the Hellenes.

³ *Indo-European* is deemed by later writers a more correct designation. — Tr.

ditions. All men are of one and the same species; all can recognize each other as brothers. The most degraded savage is still a man in body and soul; the mind that has its seat in the brain of the Hottentot does not differ in kind from that of the Frenchman, and the affections of an Australian are of the same nature with those of the German. No people can boast themselves the sole possessors of a single virtue, and the vices found in any one nation reappear among all others. The languages of men, one in their origin, are also essentially one in kind; they give to the same thoughts analogous expression. All men, finally, have the same spirit, and no human being is excluded from the privilege of entering into communion with God. While in the most civilized nations some sink by their corruption to a degree of brutality equal to what marks the most wretched tribes, the power of the Divine Spirit elevates the worst of savages to a level with the most intelligent men of European communities, and establishes by insensible degrees a spiritual and Divine unity among all the races of the earth, who are descended from the same stock and are of the same blood.

Sin, which, from the first, has sought to destroy the unity of the human family by exaggerating the differences of race, has not, therefore, succeeded in its principal aim; while it has been able to disarrange and modify, but by no means to thwart, the Divine plan in the development of humanity.

The parts of the earth most favorable to human development (hither Asia, with India, Northern Africa and Europe) are occupied by the whites, among whom are found the only nations that, from an inferior condition, have gradually risen to a state of comparative perfection. On their right and left are degenerate and stationary nations. Towards the west and south, men transgress through excess of life and want of thought. The Hamites, or Africans, are the race of physical life, of sensual pleasures, of levity of character, of enjoyment; the Malayan Japhethites, the race of ardent passions and of activity. Towards the north and east the faults arise from want of life, from feebleness of body and soul, and a sort of imbecility. The Mongols are dull, cold, worldly and prosaic; repose seems to be their distinctive characteristic, as apathy, sedateness, passiveness is that of the American.

The focus of humanity is among the whites, and is double; faith, or spiritual life, has its seat among the Semitic; civiliza-

tion, or intellectual life, among the Japhetic whites. The Japhetic Mongols, Malays and Americans participate, within certain limits, in the general development of humanity, and have for their vocation the exercise of the lower faculties of the mind. The descendants of Ham are far more degenerate than those of Japheth, and remain stationary in their barbarism and corruption.

The descendants of Shem are the privileged race to whom God has revealed himself; the sons of Japheth are Gentiles, who seek God without always finding Him, although He is not far from every one of them, and who have welcomed the Gospel which was rejected by the Jews; the children of Ham lie under a curse.¹

8. *The Shemites.*

The Shemites are to the human family what the spirit is to the soul, the organ by which life is given to the whole being. It is in the tents of Shem that Japheth seeks the knowledge of the truth (Gen. 9: 27). Accordingly, God has given to the children of Shem the post of honor on the earth. He assigned them a dwelling place in the centre of the old world, in that transition quarter of Asia which lies adjoining Europe and Africa, and unites in itself the several characteristics of the three continents. But, in his provident love, he gave to what was to be their country little of the elements of wealth, and clothed it with few attractions; his hand, prodigal of its gifts to other regions, seems to have been sparing of the blessings bestowed upon this. Everything was so arranged that the Shemites should become herdsmen and dwell in tents; for of the two kinds of occupation between which the fathers of mankind must necessarily choose, the pastoral life was exposed to fewer dangers than that of agriculture. Being harassed by less care and enjoying more leisure, the spirit rises more freely, during the long days, on the wings of prayer towards the throne of the God of Heaven; and fathers transmit to their sons, with the treasure of their faith, pure blood, a sound understanding, simple manners; not much science, but an unperverted mind; small riches, but a contented heart. Yet, if the forms of nature in the midst of which the Shemites

¹ The curse that falls upon a race does not preclude the salvation of a large number of individuals belonging to it; just as a people blessed of God may have in its bosom many who will destroy themselves.

dwelt, exposed them to few temptations, and did not divert to itself the religious regard due to God, it provided for their thoughts at least a poetic dress, and furnished images so lively, so brilliant, and so distinct, as to become engraved, as by a pen of fire, upon their understanding, while vague reveries and extravagant fancies are equally unknown. The distinctive features of their physical constitution are the great height of the forehead and the length of the head. Their languages have a very peculiar character; they are fitted for enthusiasm, for sublime poetry, and for prophecy. In their nervous and hardy frame dwells a soul, noble, self-relying, serious, earnest, inclined more to profound meditation than to enlarged views. They have neither sciences nor fine arts; their social relations are extremely simple, and their whole existence made up of impulse and action; their hearts are instinctively closed against everything mean; their thoughts and wishes are bent upon a single interest by which they are wholly absorbed, and fanaticism is always ready to take possession of them.

Of all the Semitic tribes one only, which was chosen of God and led as by the hand, failed to wander from the path which had been marked out for them. For two thousand years the Hebrews were the high priests of humanity and the sole depositaries of Divine truth. They were the people of God in the midst of Paganism, with which it was their duty to avoid all communion; and from them hath come salvation for the world (John 4: 22). For them God had prepared a peculiar dwelling place, which was, on the one hand, at the centre among the nations, and, on the other, isolated from all the countries immediately bordering upon it; a Hebrew park, a garden full of exquisite fruits and protected by a well-kept hedge against the wild beasts of the desert; a country blessed above all others, upon which the heavens rained down righteousness and which brought forth salvation; a sacred land, a land of miracles, which often heard the voice of the Lord and of his messengers, and which trembled with affright when it saw the Son of God dying for us upon the cross.

The Arabs were brethren of the Hebrews (through Joktan and Ishmael), and the country inhabited by them also combined the advantages of a position at the same time central and insulated. But with them the Lord had made no covenant, and many of their tribes, which had always before their eyes the

wonders wrought by Jehovah in favor of his people, far from being drawn by that means away from their idolatry, hardened themselves more and more, and continued enemies of the Hebrews to the day of their destruction. The same spirit, doubtless, animated the other Arab tribes, and in the fulness of time sprung from their bosom the greatest of false prophets and the most violent enemy of Christ. Mohammed, a man of sensual character, who pretended to be the Comforter promised by Jesus to his disciples, formed, from the prompting of a mind from which every noble truth was shut out, and a heart corrupted by sensual indulgence, a religion without mysteries, without self-denial, and without sacrifices; which he supported by impostures, or by the recital of senseless visions as well as by the promise of a sensual paradise, and which he established by arms and blood. He beguiled the Arabs, who became the high priests of falsehood; and the burning and monotonous nature in the bosom of which they lived, helped the sin that was in them to transform the religious enthusiasm proper to their race into a sanguinary fanaticism.

Half the human race worship Jesus Christ or Mohammed, both descendants of Abraham (Gen. 9: 27). The former is the son of the free woman and of promise; the latter, the illegitimate progeny of a slave.

Yet along the banks of the Euphrates and the Tigris, upon the plains of Senaar and Babylon, and as far as the shores of the Persian Gulf, dwelt other Semitic nations, Babylonians and Assyrians, whom the fertility of their soil and a flourishing commerce turned quite away from God, by filling their hearts with all the vanities of earth. Before the coming of Christ, Babylon was the rival of Jerusalem, and the capital of the kingdom of darkness; but it was not, like Mecca afterwards, the home of a false prophet, and might, indeed, be said to partake of the irreligious spirit of its Japhetic neighbors.

Within the limits of the Holy Land a stranger race had become established; descendants of Canaan, who had not followed their brethren, the children of Ham, in their migrations southward, but had remained in the midst of the Semitic tribes, whose language they spoke. They became in Judea servants of the Hebrews, and built, along the coast at the foot of Lebanon, several cities, that became celebrated for commerce and wealth, as well as for their numerous colonies, but whose inhabitants were more

radically corrupt, more estranged from God, than any of the neighboring nations.

9. *Japhethites.*

It was the lot of the sons of Japheth to develop and to use the powers with which God has enriched the human mind. Now the instinct of society, the ideas of property and of justice, skill in mechanic arts and trades, and the higher powers employed in science and the fine arts, can be developed only among a people occupying fixed abodes; and agriculture is the basis of civilization. God, therefore, prepared for the children of Japheth regions whose fertility invited man to cultivate the soil, and where a limited extent of country would suffice for the support of a large population.

Civilized nations found cities, build magnificent edifices, have political institutions of a very complicated character, enact numerous laws, possess great wealth, have an extensive commerce, while the works of their artists and learned men crown them with a dazzling glory. Their employments are various, but for the most part there is wanting among them the one thing necessary, the knowledge of the true God; and the abuse of the very blessings bestowed upon them has caused them to sink, from the era of their highest prosperity, into an abyss of corruption and wretchedness. All nomade nations, on the contrary, remaining ever youthful, the Lord, who knows from the beginning that the end of every civilized nation is death, has provided for the renewal of their life and vigor by placing on their frontiers wandering hordes of shepherds whom he may call in at the needful moment to infuse fresh and pure blood into the decrepid body; and as the Semitic shepherds had a vocation still more important, he reserved, from among the Japhethites themselves, certain tribes of whom he made nomades, and to each of which he entrusted the work of invading the nearest of its civilized brethren. For the execution of this plan he formed, on the north of the agricultural regions, that stretch along from China, through Iran and Asia Minor, and through the southern peninsulas of Europe, a zone of deserts, steppes, forests, and comparatively unproductive plains, which discourage agriculture, and compel, or at least invite, the inhabitants to become nomadic shepherds. But to guard against too frequent invasions, he separated the

nomades from the cultivators of the soil by high mountain ranges. And, as the civilized countries of Asia were to remain long strangers to the Christian faith, which is the true regeneration of humanity, he secured for them a permanent source of physical revivication, by depriving the nomades on the north (Mongols, Turks) of all possibility of cultivating the soil and taking rank among civilized nations; while in Europe the barbarians, when they had invaded the Roman empire and received the Gospel, took for themselves, by degrees, permanent homes, and changed their forests and the ranges of their flocks and herds into cultivated fields, as in Germany, Poland, Russia.

The Japhethic races embrace a far greater population than the Semitic; for the soul has many and various powers, while the spirit has but a single object. The Japhethic whites represent the higher capacities of the soul, politics, jurisprudence, science, and the fine arts; the Japhethic Mongols, its lower capacities, domestic life, agriculture, industry. The former took possession of the most beautiful regions of Asia, and that Europe which, in its physical constitution, is the most perfect of continents. The latter spread themselves over the massive and monotonous regions of Eastern Asia.

The Indo-Germanic nations exhibit at the same time a great diversity of character and the most surprising likeness in language and manners. Among them are the best formed and most beautiful of the human race; the face is more oval and more regular than among the children of Shem, and all the features have an air of more sweetness. The temper is less violent, and more amiable; the thoughts less elevated, but more comprehensive; the understanding more acute, the sphere of activity far more varied, and the languages richer and more regular. The Indo-Germanic nations embrace all the most civilized people of the earth, and include no nomades (that is, if the Turks are reckoned as a Mongol race).

Iran is the country of light. The sun clothes it in the most brilliant colors; from the bosom of the earth burst forth remarkable fires. Iran is thus the country of extremes; deserts of sand border upon the richest valleys. Iran reveals the holiness of God and his hatred of evil. Towards these regions the Lord directed Madai, the genius of whose descendants is practical and moral, with a clear understanding, and a quick sense of right and wrong. They have preserved the primitive traditions

better than any other Japhethic race; their ancient faith divides man, earth and heaven into a realm of light and a realm of darkness; adores fire as the purest symbol of Divinity, and makes man a warrior in daily conflict with evil. Here are no idols, no absurd fables. But the fallen angel hath become equal with God; the earth is the realm of fear, and life one long exorcism.

India is the land of wonders. Earth there displays all her richness and all her beauty; she announces to man the omnipotence of Him who created and who preserves all things, and the power of death to which every creature is subject. Objects that he sees around him, speak to him of an invisible Being, who has diffused on every side a superabundance of life, and who acts constantly and everywhere with a mysterious energy. This is the proper home of a speculative race, whose whole life ought to be the worship of God, thoughts of God, hymns to God. But, under the dominion of sin, the spirit of the Hindû trembles, as it were, before a nature terrible to him in its grandeur; he worships all its powers and all its phenomena, and falls into a moral sleep; he takes his dreams for realities, and transforms truth by hideous caricature; his religion is made up of frightful ecstasies, barbarous penances, innumerable ceremonies; he has neither conscience nor will, and, in his profound debasement, he has not even a word in his language to express the sentiment of hope.¹

The Hindû Japhethites seem to have imparted their civilization to the descendants of Ham in Egypt, the land of the Nile and the country of riddles. By the Egyptians, the faith they borrowed from India was mingled with Hametic fetichism and magic. By the contrast between the beautiful valley of the river and the desert sands that skirted it, nature shadowed to them the important truth of an incessant war between good and evil; and the Nile, by its inundations, made them industrious and inventive, and taught them geometry.

High and narrow plains, inhabited chiefly by Japhethites, divided into many small tribes, formed connecting links between Iran and Greece, Asia and Europe, and were constantly desolated by wars.

Greece is the region of harmony. Land and sea are in suitable proportions to each other; the aspect of nature is at once both cheerful and serious; the soil yields its fruits with a wise

¹ See on India in general, and for this characteristic of the people, C. Von Raumer's *Lehrbuch der Allgemeine Geographie*, Leipsic, 1836, pp. 435—470.

discretion, as it were; and external influences determine the employments of man, while yet so gentle as to admit of the freest choice. The Greeks were a people of serene and well-tempered spirit. With them all the powers of the soul were perfectly balanced; reason kept the imagination within due bounds; the life of thought and the life of action went hand in hand; republican forms of government reconciled personal liberty with devotion to the common cause, and united in one body politic all the individuals of the community; the fine arts contributed to the glory of the State and to the support of religion; the moral and physical sciences were successfully cultivated; public religious ceremonies were continually turning men's minds to the gods; and, while other nations peopled the invisible world with frightful divinities, symbolic of the powers of nature, or imagined it a desert and without inhabitant, Olympus was the dwelling-place of deified men representing the State, the family, love, beauty, war, science, eloquence, the fine arts, agriculture, etc. But in this assembly no God of holiness was found. The Greeks were a childish and fickle race; they had lost the profound meaning of the primitive traditions, and offered no expiatory sacrifices. Their serenity was that of a man who forgets sin and death amid worldly enjoyments and occupations; their fine balance of intellect concealed the want of spiritual insight and elevation; and the brief epoch of their prosperity is a sort of prediction of the endless period when the faithful shall rejoice in God their Saviour.

In the regions occupied by the other Indo-Germanic races, nature exerted upon man far less influence than in Greece, and especially than in Asia; and the influence it had was rather by reason of what was wanting, than through any positive and characteristic features. It claimed for itself little of man's attention, and addressed him unfrequently and in a low voice; it threw no great obstacles in his way, but allowed him to act with freedom; neither barren nor very fertile, it gave food to him only who should earn it by the sweat of his brow. But in proportion as outward physical influences decreased, man grows and puts forth his strength, showing less sensibly the impress of the country he inhabits; and his character can by no means be referred to the influences of a nature that he overtops on every side.

In Italy, at the centre of the Mediterranean world, there was built up, by the mingling of three races, Rome, the capital of the

west. A practical city, rather moral than religious, not much inclined to science or art, her mission was to develop the ideas of nationality and of justice; and the Romans became the statesmen and jurists of humanity.

Three large Japhethic nations occupied the centre and northern peninsula of Europe, the Celts, the Germans, and the Slaves. The Celts inherited a spirit of liberty, a healthy and practical understanding, and a disposition remarkably social. The Slaves, who have not to this day made themselves fully known, seem, by their submissive and servile spirit, and also by their childish and superstitious faith, destined to counterbalance the influence of the Celts in the history of human affairs. The Germans combine the qualities of these two extremes, and are distinguished besides by an affectionate and pensive disposition, an honest heart, and a kind of instinct for invisible things.

Christianity spread over Europe, and became the universal faith at the time when the government passed from the hands of the Romans into those of the Germans. The Germans, Scandinavians and English, the French (heirs of the Celtic genius), the Spaniards and the Italians, and, finally, the Russians (representing the Slavonic race), are the depositories of modern and Christian civilization. Germany is the land of faith and of thought; England, that of State-policy and of religious worldly activity; France, that of society; Italy has been that of the fine arts.

The Japhethic Mongols are separated from the Semitic races by an immense zone of Indo-Germanic nations, and do not enjoy in full measure the life that is diffused through diseased mankind. Their stature is diminutive, their energy small, their affections cold, their understanding feeble, and especially are they deficient in religious sentiment. Their primitive creeds have given place to Buddhism, which is of Indian origin. It proclaims a Deity of negative attributes; represents as the superior good a state in which one does nothing, thinks nothing, feels nothing, and is lost in an abyss of nothingness; and it requires no expiatory sacrifices. The Mongol race embraces not only the nomadic Mongols, Turks and Scythians, but really savage tribes, Siberians and Esquimaux, whose religious notions are undefined, who worship rude idols and employ sorcerers for priests; and also nations (Chinese, Japanese and Indo-Chinese), who, having reached their highest degree of development, remain there, specimens of crystallized humanity.

The Chinese carried into their country the depth of sentiment and of thought which belongs to the Indo-Germanic nations, and their civilization dates from the same epoch with that of India and Assyria. But the life of the body politic quickly died away among them, and society, like a crystal, was organized but not developed. They soon sank into an entire indifference to invisible things. It is a question whether their reformer Confucius, who lived many ages before Christ, believed in the existence of God; and a practical atheism pervades unrivalled their countless multitudes. Yet they have not been able to destroy in themselves the organ of faith, which is the spiritual mouth of man; and the time may perhaps be at hand when they will feed on the bread of life.

Embosomed in the equinoctial seas, live the insular Malays. Their faith and manners have decided points of likeness to those of India; in their physical constitution they have many traits characteristic of the Mongols. Of the four degraded races they approach nearest the whites. They are distinguished by great activity, but only in regard to worldly things; by violent and ungoverned passions, and by cruelty and corruption.

Finally, the aborigines of America are in all respects inferior to their Mongol and Malay brethren. They have not had skill to domesticate the ox, and reckon among them no pastoral or nomade tribe. Innumerable small tribes of hunters or fishermen occupied, not long ago, and in some cases still occupy, regions exceedingly favorable to the development of civilization; and the only cultivated nations of America were ignorant of even the art of writing.

10. *Hamites.*

The descendants of Ham might have displayed in its purity the whole physical life of man; but their ancestor had drawn down upon himself the curse of God, and he transmitted to his descendants his corruption and his punishment. Under a glowing sky, upon an isolated and compact continent, in physical conditions most unfavorable to the mind and the heart, the descendants of Ham spontaneously became negroes. The back part of the head, which is the seat of the animal passions, was largely developed; the skull became depressed, the nose was flattened, the lips grew thick, the hair woolly, and the figure lost

its nobler traits. The negroes of our time are a fleshly and sensual race.

The children of Ham are in reality just about as little known as the continent that belongs to them; and there is at work among them a mystery of iniquity which dates back to the earliest ages of the world, and was probably received by the sons of Ham from the children of Cain. "All the negroes," said Hérodotus, "are enchanterers," sorcerers. The only invisible power they adore is the devil, and their worship is all in blood. Human victims are slain with horrible refinements of cruelty, and the white clay for their temples is kneaded with human gore. The primitive traditions are utterly lost among them, and they have no ear for the voice of the heavens or the revelations of earth. Their idols, or fetiches, are an animal, a tree, a stone, a piece of furniture, a bone, an egg-shell, etc. chosen by chance for its god by an individual or a tribe, and changed as caprice may dictate. They are the only race, no tribe of which has ever anywhere taken rank among civilized nations. They destroy one another continually by bloody wars, and from the earliest historic period have hunted one another, and sold their prisoners for slaves. But in modern times their cupidity has come in contact with that of Europeans. The two parties have mutually stimulated one another; the trade in negroes has been immensely increased; redoubled blows of the whip of slavery have echoed through the land, driving into exile the negro, whose corruption and whose punishment are without parallel elsewhere on the face of the earth. But God, who punishes them, excludes them not from the embrace of His love. Even in foreign lands, negro slaves learn to know the Saviour, and Christian charity returns them to the home of their fathers, where they exhibit, in the presence of their idolatrous brethren, the example of a community founded in faith and on the principles of true liberty.

11. *The Nations as a Whole.*

The nations, considered as a whole, constitute in some sense a single being, an individual. They are the manifestation in the external world, in space, of all the invisible things that are within man; each represents a faculty, an instinct, a tendency. Together they constitute a whole; and in this fact there is certainly still another proof, for whoever will receive such proofs,

that the human race is of one blood, and that all men are brethren.

Such are the characteristics of nations and such their distribution over the earth; here are the deep foundations upon which must be built up the temple of human history. Such, too, are the doings of sin, which has made the spiritual races to believe a lie; has turned away from the true God the intellectual; reduced to the slavery of sense the physically preëminent, and shut up all men under the same condemnation.

But who are we, that we should attempt to fathom the designs of God, and to tell our brethren what we seem to comprehend of them? Thy ways, O Lord, are as high above our thoughts as the heavens are higher than the earth (Is. 55: 9). We cannot seize them with a glance, and hardly can we understand parts of them (Job 26: 14).

12. *History.*

The period of the creation of races has passed away, and history begins. The nations develop themselves, each according to the character given it by God and nature, and humanity enters upon its march towards the glorious goal seen at the end of its career on the confines of time and eternity. Nature imparts henceforth only intimations and uncoercive influences; conscience takes the place of instinct, and man passes out of the domain of physical necessity into that of liberty. Sin, finally, which never rests, seeks, by all the means at its command, to obstruct, to harass, to destroy, the races and the humanity which still, under the eye of God, advance slowly and with difficulty along their destined path.

The march of humanity is progressive; it grows up and enlarges itself; and just as its several nations represent all man's various faculties, so also is its life in many respects like that of an individual.

But, as a result of sin, this life is not equally diffused throughout the whole body of humanity; and the development spoken of progresses, with some degree of completeness, only among certain nations; the rest lag behind, or are even like dead members.

The privileged nations have each a particular part to act; and when that is done, they disappear from the stage. The life of

humanity, therefore, at distinct epochs, transfers its principal seat from one country to another, and seems to traverse the whole face of the earth. Now the hand of God, from the beginning, marked out for this traveller the path he must tread, and prepared for him, at proper distances, residences appropriate to his wants; wants varying with his age. He was born in the warm and fertile regions of the east, where he passed his infancy on the bosom of a nature prodigal of her gifts. Advancing towards the north-west, he came into Greece and Italy, those beautiful and happy regions where all the powers of his being were awakened, and prepared for active and joyous life; and there passed the years of his youth. In his maturity, his home is in temperate Europe, which is more serious and less fertile than the lands of the east and the south. And, if his course is still onward in the same direction, he is to cross the Atlantic, and there, amid the free institutions of republican America, shall finish a long life begun under the despotic yoke of an eastern sovereign.

But all the aids, all the admonitions, all the revelations which men received from nature, all the moral strength that they found in God, all the blessings that he bestowed upon them, all the salutary chastisements that they received from his hand, the influence even of that eternal Light which enlighteneth them from their birth, could not deliver them from the power of sin which pervades their whole being and is part of themselves. Thus, in a few generations after the deluge, they had already become estranged from the true God, whose works they went about to worship, or whom they forsook for dumb idols; and God left all the nations, with a single exception, to go the way of their own choice, yet without ever ceasing to give them evidence of his existence and his goodness (Acts 14: 16, 17). Nevertheless, if this new post-diluvian humanity wandered, like the antediluvian, from the right way, yet, as its powers were broken and the consequences of sin pressed heavily upon it, the feeling of its fall and its slavery remained, and all nations sighed and still sigh for deliverance. Nature herself prays for it, and he who can understand a voice without words (Ps. 19: 3), hears what nature says (Rom. 8: 19—23). The animal that suffers and dies, the plant that decays, the crystal whose life is, as it were, imprisoned, all irrational natures groan together by reason of the vanity to which the sin of man hath made them subject. The earth, that immense cemetery where death reigns with

such power and is so active that life seems hardly to be more than a stranger there; the earth which remembers its own primitive beauty, and feels within itself the whole weight of the curse; the earth itself groans for a better time.

Man, in all ages and in all climates, sighs through life for the happiness which he lost by estranging himself from God, and which he thinks to find again in the pursuit of pleasure, wealth and glory. But wherever the dwellings of men are found, there arise continually upon the air, either the shoutings of an empty joy, or the cries of pain, or the sighs of disappointed hope, or the curses of despair. The most ardent love, the closest and sweetest ties of domestic affection, fail to satisfy entirely the human heart; a fathomless abyss, which God alone can fill. The purest earthly bliss is suddenly interrupted by some long and painful disease, and is evermore embittered by the thought of death. And even were men shielded from disease and death, conscience is ever there like an unwelcome witness, whose mere presence is a continual reproach.

Pursued by this inward voice, which testifies against them with ceaseless accusations (Rom. 2: 15), men dare not appear before a holy God, and anxiously seek means whereby they may avert his displeasure. Everywhere is found a class of priests, who intercede with God for the people, and in all nations where the moral sense has not been entirely false, altars are drenched with the blood of sacrifices. But the multitude of sacrifices fail to give the wished-for assurance of pardon.

"What is truth?" asks every man in whose spirit there is still any degree of light (Matt. 6: 23). Who will teach me to know God, and make me acquainted with invisible things? What am I? What awaits the soul beyond the grave? What must I do to be saved? But the pagan religions are like a night whose shades are relieved but by some pale reflection from the eternal brightness. Philosophers in vain spent their life in the pursuit of truth; which appeared to some of them as a veiled and shadowy form, receding as they would approach, while others, and the majority, saw her not at all, and ended their search in the denial of her existence.¹

¹ *Philosophia quaerit, religio possidet veritatem.* Philosophy seeks for truth in vain; religion hath it without seeking, inasmuch as she receives it from God by direct revelation. The philosophers investigate all sorts of arguments in favor of the existence of God, and come to no satisfactory solution of the problem of

Everywhere and always social order is threatened by passion and by crime; and princes or people seek to secure it by means of political institutions, and laws of various kinds. But the labors of the fathers never saved the sons from the necessity of similar labors; for the very foundations of the structure are bad.

Now, what means this search after happiness, pardon, truth and social order? It is the only occupation in which all men are engaged, and yet it leads no solitary being of them all to the goal! There is this meaning in it, namely, that man is not in his normal condition, since, in the midst of all his rich possessions, there is still wanting to him the one thing needful, the only treasure that can make him happy; there is a confession, that it is impossible for him, with all his efforts, himself to fill the emptiness of his heart and terminate his own sufferings; and also the hope that a merciful God, who hears the sighing of his creatures, may bestow upon them the bliss that has been forfeited by their sin.

In truth, God was moved with compassion for the wretched children of Adam, and, from ancient times (for the future is with him as the past), had prepared for them a wonderful salvation, which is heaven-high above the thoughts of men, and in which his mercy and truth have kissed each other (Ps. 85: 10).

13. *Redemption.*

When idolatry began to spread itself over the whole world, God set apart Abraham, the father of the faithful, to whom he renewed the promise of a Redeemer, which he had made to Adam on the very day of his fall; and, while he convinced the pagans of sin by leaving them to plunge deeper and deeper into the darkness of idolatry, to the Hebrews he made known the moral law in all its strictness, in order to awaken and strengthen in them a sense of human depravity and of the Divine holiness; and, at the same time, by means of prophecies and a typical service, he gave them a strong assurance that in due time the Messiah would appear for their deliverance.

creation; the unlearned believer opens the Bible and, reading on the first page the words: In the beginning *God created*, at once knows more of the subject than Aristotle and Plato. Philosophy doubts about the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and liberty and necessity; religion teaches the Trinity, the resurrection of the body, and the double doctrine of election and responsibility. Philosophy hardly reaches the point where religion begins.

And thou didst finally appear, Christ Jesus! thou, whom for thousands of years the sighings of nature, the longings of the pagan and the faith of the Hebrew had foretold; thou, who art the fulfilment of all the promises that God had made to men and of all the hopes that he had put into the hearts of his creatures (2 Cor. 1: 20).

Glory, therefore, be ascribed on earth and in heaven to the Son of God, who hath come to destroy the works of the devil (1 John 3: 8) and to restore all things (Acts 3: 21). He purifieth man, humanity, nature; and not only restores to them their primitive beauty, but raises them to a height of glory towards which even our faith hardly dares to direct its eye.

Glory to the Saviour of the world, who died on the cross a sacrifice for our sins, and whose blood, that cleanseth from all pollution, has flowed out from Golgotha over the face of the whole earth! Glory to the Sovereign-priest, who ever intercedes with the Father for us! Priests, cease your sacrifices, the victim whom all your victims prefigure, has offered himself once for all. Nations, rejoice in him who hath purchased for you a complete salvation and whose death is your life.

Glory to him who is life eternal, and who from the high heavens sheds it down upon earth where are found only the dead! He comes to dwell in our hearts, which he enlightens with his gentle rays, and out of which he drives the usurper; he extirpates by degrees the countless roots of sin; he fills us with his spirit, with himself; he kindles in our hearts an infinite love, which destroys our selfishness, and which enables us to understand what joy really is. We enter anew our primitive orbit, and revolve again around the Great Centre of Being and of Bliss. Indissoluble bonds unite us with our brethren and with all men, and the assurance of endless bliss breaks for us the sting of death. But Jesus Christ hath done yet more; by the ineffable mystery of his broken body and shed blood, he renews not only our souls to righteousness, but our bodies also to immortality; his glorified body became like unto our corruptible bodies, which he endows with endless life, and will raise again, spiritual and glorious (1 Cor. xv.). We are, therefore, of his flesh and of his bones (Eph. 5: 30), and shall become like unto him (1 John 3: 2). He hath made us all kings and priests, and we shall reign with him on the earth forever and ever (Rev. 5: 10—20; 22: 5).

We shall reign with Christ on the earth; and by him already

are we delivered from slavery to nature. The Esquimaux, becoming her disciple, learns the value of durable riches, infinitely superior to the transient possessions that before occupied him wholly; his desires are elevated, his views expand, his understanding is developed by communion with the spirit of God. By faith the negro is freed from the yoke of sensual pleasure, and, even in the home of his fathers, learns to be industrious and chaste. Faith restores the Divine image in the soul of the negro and of the Esquimaux, long before the redemption of their body (Rom. 8: 23), which must also at the resurrection become like unto Christ. Through Jesus Christ, we enjoy all the bounties of nature without giving our hearts to them, and without abusing them.¹ Through him we are enabled to comprehend the language of the earth and of the skies, which speak to us of their Creator.

Glory to Him who is the truth and the light of the world! In him are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (Col. 2: 13); his disciples are no longer obliged to seek vainly for truth, but by his Spirit they are enabled to search all things, even the deep things of God (1 Cor. 2: 10).

Glory to the Supreme Lawgiver! He writeth his laws upon our hearts, and for him, if faith be found as a grain of mustard-seed, it suffices to ensure the peace and order of a nation. All human legislators, who search in vain after his secret, are prophets of his appearing, though they know him not.

Glory to the Head of the church, to the King of the whole world! The prince of this world hath laid waste the empire of Christ; he hath filled it with confusion, banished love from its borders, isolated nations from each other, and hath spread over all a thick dark veil (Is. xxv.), that crushes them to the earth and deprives them of light from above; and the only fellowship that he establishes among men, is that of condemnation and death. But Jesus Christ triumphed over him when he died upon the cross (Col. 2: 13); he overthrew every power not established

¹ Yet it is certain that nature is dangerous even to Christians, because sin has its principal seat (*principal*, I say; not *only* seat) in the body and soul, or the flesh, and because man, as to the flesh, is part of nature. In consequence of this, nature is held in poor esteem by most Christians. But the time is coming when the Christian, finding himself in God's strength, mighty against the world of sense, will find therein abundant spiritual blessings of which we have yet but a vague presentiment. Nature is an immense volume, of which we have, as yet, hardly read the first pages.

by himself (1 Cor. 15: 24), and the day approaches when he will subdue all his enemies under his feet, and glorify, by the severity of their punishment, the justice of the Living God. But already is he removing the thick darkness that covers the nations; he is forming unto himself a peculiar people (Tit. 2: 14), which he makes up of people out of every tribe and nation, of every variety of language and of countenance; he reestablishes the unity of the human race by founding, through a new creation, an everlasting unity of spirit and of life among all the descendants of Shem, Japheth, and Ham, alike, who believe on him; he hastens the time when all who belong to the kingdom of heaven shall, therefore, speak but one language (for already they are all in heart of the same tongue), and his true church, which is still confounded with the world, glorifies God by manifesting, but to the view of angels (Eph. 3: 10), the manifold wisdom of God.

Finally, will the Son of God leave to his enemy the satisfaction of having inflicted upon irrational creatures innumerable wounds which no one has the wish, no one the power, to heal? No; not in vain shall the earth sigh for its deliverance. The time draws near when waters shall spring up in the dry place, and rivers in the desert which shall blossom as the rose; in the region sacred to the Lord, within the limits of the future kingdom of God, the myrtle shall grow instead of the brier, and instead of the thorn the fir-tree; no wild beast shall go thither, and such as remain in the land shall be changed; the wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox; believers who are there reunited shall no more be subject to disease; no longer shall be found there a child who shall live but a few days, nor an old man who shall fail to attain fulness of years, and he that may die at the age of a hundred years shall be still young (Is. xxxv. lv. lxx.). Thus will the earth prepare herself, during this epoch of transition,¹ to enter, with its inhabitants, upon an eternal state. Yet it also must pass through a

¹ According to the Bible, the history of the earth appears to divide itself into five periods. 1. an epoch of formation, separation and production: the earth is very good; 2. an epoch of disarrangement and transition, from the fall of man to the deluge: the earth passes from its primitive to its actual state; 3. the existing epoch, where the earth sighs to be restored; 4. the epoch of restoration and transition, or the millennium: evil begins to disappear, and the earth passes from its actual to its final condition; 5. the new earth, which shall endure forever, spiritual, like the spiritual bodies of men risen from the dead, and perfectly pure.

death and resurrection; fire shall consume it because of the transgressions of the wicked (2 Pet. iii.), which have rendered a progressive transformation impossible; but thus shall it be purified from all evil and all vanity. Then shall it come forth in its resurrection, glorious and without spot, and become the everlasting Jerusalem, where the redeemed of Christ shall reign forever and ever.

Marvellous things are they, O earth, that are spoken of thee. But you will tell me the earth is too small to be worthy of so glorious a destiny. The voyager, traversing the immense Pacific, and occupied entirely with the magnificent landscape of the island he visits, takes no notice of the little rocks along the shore; and the earth is only such a rock. Its existence even is known to only three or four of the nearest planets; the inhabitants of Saturn, if they are like us, have never seen it, and how can the stars have heard a word about us? Hardly can they have noticed the sun among the ranks of the celestial armies. Man chooses rather to depreciate the earth, under a show of humility, than to aim at regaining the title of king of the universe.¹ The earth is so small! you say; but do you not know that the pile of stars which are the glory of our milky way, are to us but an almost undistinguishable spot? And if the creation is not infinite, however vast its dimensions may be, we can suppose a distance from which it must appear to the eye as a mere luminous point, and a position still more remote at which it must entirely disappear. Now if there is nothing so immense but that it may become invisible to man, what, then, are material dimensions for Him who is a Spirit, and hath not his life in space? Is there anything great in the eyes of an Infinite Being? Is there anything little to the heart of a God whose name is love? In the human body, the most important members are not those which occupy most space; and in the history of humanity the largest² nations are not the most celebrated; why should heaven be ruled by different laws from earth? The sidereal world certainly forms a whole, that is made up of groups of stars; and our solar system has its assigned place in this vast organism. It is the Judea, the Holy Land, of the heavens. And besides, the Lord exalteth whom he will, and dispenses his grace accord-

¹ Saint Martin, on Truth and Error, Vol. II. p. 117.

² Compare Europe with the other continents; Greece with Persia; Athens with China; the single city of Rome with the whole of Africa.

ing to his own good pleasure. He chooses even the weakest things to confound the mighty, that no flesh may glory in his presence (1 Cor. 1: 27—29); he is pleased to make his power known by the use of the weakest and most despised instruments. Rejoice, O earth, for thou art a spectacle to angels, whose eyes are fixed upon thee; rejoice, for thou art the celestial Bethlehem; and, although thou art little among the thousands of the stars, yet out of thee shall He come forth who shall be the Ruler of the universe (Micah 5: 2).

ARTICLE II.

GOD'S POSITIVE MORAL GOVERNMENT OVER MORAL AGENTS, ADDITIONAL TO THAT WHICH IS MERELY NATURAL.

By Rev. Samuel D. Cochrane, Paterson, N. J.

MORAL beings have a definite constitution by which they are honorably distinguished from all other beings. This constitution they have no power to annihilate or change; its essence and laws are as imperishable and immutable as the fiat of the Eternal Will and Wisdom which spoke them into existence and endowed them with immortality. By virtue of it, they are, from the moment their moral agency commences, not only capable, but under an absolute necessity, of recognizing a moral law, and themselves as subject to it; of obeying, or refusing to obey it; and of experiencing certain elements of happiness as results of obedience, and of unhappiness as results of disobedience. Such is their constitution; and the law, or rule of action, they recognize, is the law of God. The elements of happiness they experience, as natural consequences of obedience, are manifold: the approving smile and benedictions of conscience; inward harmony and peace; enjoyment arising from the consciousness of worthily combating and controlling the appetites, desires and passions; satisfaction from the consciousness of deserving the complacency of the intelligent universe; pleasure from witness-

ing the good they are able in any way to effect; delight from realizing the light of God's countenance beaming on the soul; blessedness conferred by hope, searching after and anticipating an eternity of virtue and its fruits; and such like things. The elements of unhappiness they experience, as natural consequences of disobedience, are manifold: the frowns and maledictions of conscience; inward tumult and war produced by collision of the perverse will with reason and conscience; conscious enslavement to pernicious and debasing habits, producing self-contempt and abhorrence; misery created by the consciousness that the frown of God is on the soul, and of deserving it and the execrations of the intelligent universe; jarring remembrances of the past, and tormenting forebodings of woes in the future; self-condemnation from witnessing the evil they do to others in so many ways; and such like things. These are the natural and necessary consequences of obedience and disobedience to the precept of that eternal and immutable law which binds all moral agents to God and to each other.

Now, it is maintained by some that these are the only sanctions of this Divine Law. They deny that God has promised to the virtuous any rewards, or threatened against the wicked any penalties, additional to these; and they accordingly repudiate all belief in a *positive moral government*, objecting to it as arbitrary, inconsistent with benevolence, unjust, and such on every account as God would not institute or administer. Of those who maintain this doctrine, some believe in the endless misery of those who die in their sins, and some do not. Those who do not, assume that, immediately upon passing into eternity, or at some subsequent period, they will exchange a sinful for a holy character, and the natural consequences of the one for those of the other, and will thenceforward continue holy and happy. Those who do, assume that, when the wicked die, their sinful character is confirmed, so that they will forever persevere in sin, and of course be forever miserable. They admit, however, that, if any should, at any stage of their future history, become *holy*, their misery would certainly terminate with their sin. The only difference between them, therefore, is, that the one believes that, at death or subsequently, all sinners will be renovated, while the other believes that none will be, who die impenitent. They both believe the connection between holiness and happiness, and between sin and misery, to be simply *natural*; they both

aspersion of the doctrine that God has instituted a positive moral government, and will bestow rewards and inflict punishments additional to the natural results of holiness and sin, as imputing arbitrariness to God and incongruous with his true character; and they both eulogize the view they take as the only one that consists with the Divine benevolence, or commends itself to rational assent.

It is a question of the highest importance whether this doctrine, or the one it opposes, is the true one; for it is very obvious that one of them must be true and the other false; and that whichever of them is false, must be radically at war with the entire system of truth presented to mankind in the word of God. Under the conviction that the difference between them is thus radical, we proceed to set forth some reasons why the one we have been exhibiting, should be rejected, and the opposite one maintained. The reasons for rejecting the former, will be direct arguments in favor of the latter.

I. The first objection we urge against this doctrine is, that, if it be true, God has in fact no proper moral government over his intelligent creatures. Moral government consists in the declaration and administration of moral law. The law consists of two parts—a *precept*, in which the rule is set forth in accordance with which moral agents are bound and required to act; and sanctions adequate to the importance of the precept, to allure and urge them to obey it. There can be no law without sanctions; for, without them, the precept would be mere advice, to be followed or not without hope or hazard of any other consequences than such as are the natural results of complying with, or disregarding it. The sanctions operate on the hopes and fears of all moral agents to whom they are actually addressed, alluring them to obedience by the good promised as its reward, and deterring them from disobedience by the evil threatened as its punishment; and the only way in which a ruler, as such, can contribute to the reign of the precept over the hearts and lives of his subjects, and thus actually be a ruler, is by administering the sanctions, using them as attractive lures and urgent goads to keep all on the path prescribed. The governmental function, therefore, is, in its very nature, an active and positive one, authoritative and controlling.

But, if the only rewards of virtue and punishments of sin are the natural consequences of each, it is self-evident that *the law*

is *self-executive*; and, on the supposition that moral agents could still continue to exist, if God were sunk into an eternal slumber, such as Hindû philosophy ascribes to Brahmâ during the eternity preceding creation, it would continue to execute itself to endless ages, the same as it will though he neither slumbers nor sleeps. It is, therefore, a ridiculous misnomer to call him a Moral Governor, if this doctrine be true. It reduces his office to "the veriest cipher of a function." It stands in the same category with the dogma of Epicurus, that "the Divine Nature is neither itself disturbed, nor does it give disturbance to others." If one had constructed a machine which, when once put in motion, would go on forever by virtue of its constitution, he might set it in motion and leave it thenceforward to itself, assured that, when he had lain in his grave ten thousand years, it would still be going the same as when it first began. His relation to his machine would be precisely similar to that which this doctrine makes to exist between God and his intelligent universe, so far as ruling it is concerned. Is this the conception of a moral government? It is not even a good parody of one. It presents us a Creator, not a Ruler; an Artist, not a Moral Governor. At bottom, it sustains to the true conception of the moral government of God, the same relation that the natural development-theory of the author of "The Vestiges of Creation" (according to which, all the worlds that roll in space, and all that they contain, were evolved from an exceedingly attenuated fire-mist, and formed into what they are by the operation of mere natural laws, without any help from God), does to the true conception of the creation. The one makes the universe *create*, the other makes it *govern* itself, by virtue of mere natural laws; and the legitimate tendency and effect of both alike is, to expel the idea of a living, acting, personal God, and all realizations concerning him, as much as possible, from the minds of men.

If it be answered, that God established the laws in both cases, and designed them to be self-executive, and that, therefore, after all, it is he that does all, we object to the answer itself, as repugnant to truth, inasmuch as it assumes that the laws, once established, are thenceforward forces independent of God; whereas, neither sound theology nor true philosophy can recognize them as anything else than *the will of God, or results of the will of God, constantly exerted according to his established purposes*. It divorces nature, throughout all her domains and all her departments, from

all direct Divine control or superintendence, and leaves her, as the ostrich leaves her egg in the sand, to unfold, and mould, and govern herself forevermore by virtue of her own inherent laws alone. The only merit it has, is, that it stops short of the insane absurdity of making the laws originate themselves. It therefore avails nothing as a defence of the doctrine against which we are objecting; for it is really that doctrine itself; and the obvious fact that, if it be true, there would be no interruption or change of the course of nature, or of the results of virtue and vice, if God should utterly abandon his creation, provided it could continue to exist without his upholding power (and no one can tell why it could not, if the assumption respecting the independence and intrinsic efficiency of natural laws, is valid), shows, that, if it be true, God has not, and cannot have, a moral government. He has a creation, but no sceptre; he has established *natural* laws, but has enacted no moral ones; moral agents are without a sovereign, and God without subjects. There is, indeed, in the fact that virtue, *as such*, is naturally followed by the elements of well-being, and sin, *as such*, by the elements of ill-being, indicated in the beginning of this Article, a striking *analogy* to moral government; an actual exemplification of the principle and purpose of it; what may be called the *natural rudiments* of it; enough to raise the probability that God actually has, and will evermore maintain such a government, to a moral certainty; but, *in itself*, it does not constitute such a government, any more than it constitutes civil government among men. This will appear with additional distinctness in the course of what we are next to urge.

II. Our next objection to this doctrine is, that it is utterly incongruous with the benevolence of God. This, we proceed to show. All moral action is put forth in view of motives; i. e. motives are the moving forces which induce or impel moral agents to will and act. If we suppose all motives, prompting to either right or wrong action, to be withdrawn from a moral agent, we thereby suppose him to be in a condition in which it is impossible for him to act at all. His condition would be analogous to that of a vessel on a motionless sea, where not a breath of wind stirs the atmosphere. And, not only is it true that we cannot act without motives, but also that the greater the array of them actually before us, which prompts to any given act or course of action is, the greater is the likelihood that we will put forth

that act, or take that course. To deny this, would be to contradict all experience and all consciousness; and, accordingly, when we wish to induce any one to put forth any act or adopt any course to which he is strongly averse, we bring to bear upon him all the motives we can, thinking thereby to win him to the desired action. It is thus that all who endeavor to influence men, continually proceed.

Now, the sanctions of law are *motives*; rewards promised, on the one hand, to those who will obey its precept, and penalties threatened, on the other, to those who will disobey it. The power of the sanctions to allure to obedience and to deter from disobedience, consists precisely in the amount of good they set forth to be secured by the one, and of evil to be incurred by the other; that is, their power consists in their efficiency to excite *the hope of good, and the fear of evil*. The ultimate end for which moral beings were made, so far as themselves are concerned, is happiness; and their thirst for it is as intense as for existence. It is the goal to which they constantly look; the magnet that constantly attracts them; and *the hope of attaining it and the fear of losing it* are the two great pillars of the arch on which all law and all government rest. "*Do this, and you shall be rewarded; do that, and you shall be punished,*" is the voice of law forever resounding throughout the universe of God. Thus the sanctions of law are motives addressed to the hopes and fears of those for whom it exists, impelling them, by the regard they have for their happiness, to obey its precept. If the rewards promised are trivial, and the penalties threatened slight, the hopes excited and fears aroused will correspond, and their efficiency will of course be feeble; but if the rewards set forth are vast and the penalties tremendous, the hope and fear inspired will be proportional, and their efficiency commensurate. Since, therefore, obedience to the precept of the moral law naturally and certainly brings happiness in its train, and disobedience misery, it follows that the only way to promote happiness and prevent misery is to promote obedience and prevent disobedience; and, since moral agents always and only act in view of motives, and the efficiency of motives to influence them to obedience and to restrain them from disobedience, is precisely commensurate with the amount of good they set before the mind to be secured by the one, and of evil to be incurred by the other, it follows that the only way to promote obedience and to prevent disobedience,

to the utmost, is, as much as possible, to increase the motives that lead to the one and that deter from the other, that excite hope and arouse fear; in other words, to make the consequences of obedience as alluring, and of disobedience as appalling as, in the nature of the case, is possible.

It seems necessary here to interpose a brief delay in the tenor of the argument, to show that, in the nature of the case, it is impossible to make the consequences of obedience alluring, and of disobedience appalling, beyond certain limits. In the first place, the rewards of virtue must, it is plain, be distributed to each one, found worthy to receive them, not only in proportion to the comparative degree of his worthiness, and of his capacity and fitness for them, but also in such kind and measure as will perfectly consist with all the just rights, immunities and privileges of every other one; or, in other words, with all the conditions of the highest possible well-being of all holy intelligences throughout the universe. When they are amplified to the full extent of these limitations, they are as vast and alluring as possible, because to swell them beyond, would be unjust, if practicable, and would really, on the whole, for that reason, diminish instead of increasing them. In the next place, it is equally plain, that the penal retributions of sin must never transcend in severity the actual guilt, or ill-desert of each transgressor. In a perfect moral government, *distributive justice must be the STANDARD* by which penalties are denounced and awarded; that is, the penalties to be inflicted on each transgressor, must be in exact proportion to his guilt; and when they are thus graduated, they are just as appalling as possible. To swell them beyond this boundary would be unjust and arbitrary, and would, therefore, be to depart from, and assail, the very nature of moral government; and, as it could not but revolt the moral sense of all intelligent beings, and work the destruction of their confidence in the government, it is evident that, instead of augmenting, it would diminish, if not annihilate, their motive power in favor of virtue. Why, on the contrary, they should be fully up to this boundary, the whole drift of this argument demonstrates.

Now, returning to the argument, since God created all moral beings, and constituted them so that they can only obtain happiness and avoid misery by obeying the precept of the moral law, he must be considered bound by the nature of benevolence to do all he can, in the nature of the case, to secure their obedience

and thereby their happiness. If obedience naturally resulted in no good, and disobedience in no evil, to the actor and his fellow beings, both would be entirely indifferent; and it would be utterly preposterous to do anything whatever to secure the one or prevent the other. And if God had foreseen that the natural consequences, now known to issue from obedience and disobedience respectively, could have been so anticipated by moral agents, without experience, by means of Divine revelation or otherwise, as to prove sufficient, as motives, actually to secure universal obedience, there could have been no necessity for adding others; although even then such addition could have done no harm, and might have done some good. But the foresight by him of the commission of one single sin, by one single moral agent, no matter how early or late in the course of the ages, would create such a necessity; for, as facts demonstrate, one single sin contains in itself a potency for evil, adequate, if not counteracted by something immeasurably more influential than mere natural consequences, even when experienced, to ruin a universe. Not only does it produce an immediate experience of evil in him that perpetrates it, but it introduces into him a spring that urges him with amazing force to repeat, and to persevere in repeating it, which is itself again strengthened by every repetition, and all perseverance in it; so that, if left to himself, his career is downward from bad to worse forever. And besides this personal evil to the transgressor, it is powerfully contagious, and propagates itself from heart to heart, as a conflagration spreads from house to house in a compact and combustible city, finding no end till all are involved and all destroyed.

This potency of sin for evil, and the necessity that positive penalties, as severe as possible, should be added to its natural consequences, in order to conserve and promote, to the highest degree, the virtue and happiness of the universe of moral beings, arise from natural relations between, and natural tendencies in, such beings; and even a hasty consideration of these relations and tendencies will suffice to demonstrate the validity of the whole argument we are now urging.

Astronomy teaches us that each particular world, and each particular system of worlds, whatever peculiarities of magnitude, consistence, or special relations may characterize either, is but a part of the stupendous whole which we call the material universe; and that such is the importance of the general law which

connects each with all, and all with each, that if one single globe should, from any cause, disown that law and forsake its sphere, it would, if unrectified by Omnipotence, infallibly result in universal ruin. World after world, quitting its orbit, would rush amain into the interminable void of surrounding space, darkling and desolate forever, or dash impetuously against its fellows, erushing and crushed, till not one of all the countless host that now holds nature's concord, would remain uningulfed in the infinite disaster. So absolutely do the order, the harmony, and the perpetuity of the very constitution of universal nature depend on the uninterrupted and perfect reign of the great law of attraction over the motion of every globe and system in the vast society of worlds. In this majestic constitution of the material creation; in the mighty ties of relationship, interdependence, and reciprocal service, by which all the countless orbs and subordinate systems that compose it, are bound together and conserved in ever reigning harmony, we have a sublime symbol of that constitution and those ties by which every moral agent, existing and to exist throughout the unmeasured scene of things, however distinguished by idiosyncrasies, capabilities, or special relations, is connected with every other one, and constitutes a part of one stupendous, all-embracing community; and in the universal disaster which, if unprevented by Omnipotence, would engulf the material creation, if one single globe, disowning the relation it sustains to its fellows, should rush lawless from its sphere, is also symbolized the infinite ruin which would infallibly result to the universe of intelligences, from the violation by one single one of them of the obligations by which the eternal law of morality binds them together in one mighty empire, if its tendencies were not arrested and restrained by the greatest possible augmentation of the motives that allure to obedience and that deter from disobedience. The very elements of the nature of moral agents which constitute them such, are, in their combinations, essentially instinct with intensely social tendencies. But for such tendencies, the only relation they could sustain to each other would be that of so many merely natural similarities. The numberless affinities which imply mutuality of interest, duty, or regard of any kind, could have no existence among them. Each would be and abide, roaming or resting, a consummate Stoic, an absolute solitary, the antitype of those savage beasts which forsake their kind and walk the wild alone. But one touch of

moral nature makes all its owners kin. However near, or severed by distant spheres; however much or little they have learned of each other; whatever special differences they know, or suppose, to exist between themselves; they cannot be indifferent to, they cannot but feel a fellowship for, and an interest in, each other; they cannot but contemplate each other as capable of the same happiness or misery, as having substantially the same attributes and susceptibilities, as mutually connected in the same great moral system, as subject to the same eternal law, and as owing each other unalloyed and perpetual good-will. Nay, so potent and prodigal are the social tendencies in them, that they spring forth into development towards even possible and fictitious existences, figured like themselves. Not even the deepest and direst depravity can entirely suppress and stifle them, except perhaps towards those whom it intensely hates. It is with admirable fidelity to this truth of nature that the great poet of *Paradise Lost* makes the arch-fiend himself have and express yearnings of sympathy for the primal pair of our race, at the very time that he was enviously contemplating their innocent joys, and fixedly meditating to blight them forever.

Involved in, and resulting from, this intensely social character of the nature of moral agents, is an amazing susceptibility of being influenced and moulded by what they witness or learn of the moral life of each other and its results — by each other's example and each other's experience; so that there is a natural and necessary moral connection of each with all, and all with each throughout the universe, and an equally natural and necessary dependence of each on all, and all on each for the realization and conservation, not only of the most perfect well-being of all and of each, but of any comparatively considerable degree of it. Thus the universe of intelligences is demonstrated to be one vitally connected *solidarity*, to use a recently imported term, one all-embracing, all-binding, all-interdependent, and all-inter-influencing empire. All this being true, it is easy to see the truth of the position advanced, that one single sin contains in itself a potency for evil, if not counteracted by something immeasurably more influential than mere natural consequences, even when experienced, to ruin a universe. How appalling this potency is, is shown by the fact that, notwithstanding all God has done to counteract it, all the depravity and misery that have invaded and darkened the universe, have issued from one primal

transgression. But for the restraining and counteracting measures the Infinite Sovereign has constantly arrayed against it, who can say to what extent it would "have swept over and ravaged his creation ere this? Who can assure us that all would not have been engulfed ere now?

Although it may seem a "wasteful and ridiculous excess," we must call attention to another ground, found in natural tendencies of moral beings, for the same grand conclusion. As the end for which they were made, so far as themselves are concerned, is happiness, God has implanted in their constitution a demand for its realization as intense as for existence itself; and, as their social and moral tendencies impel them to set their hearts on and pursue the happiness of *all*, so their personal tendencies impel them to set their hearts on and pursue their own. It was the design of the Maker that these two tendencies should dwell and operate together in perpetual amity, and thus secure the highest universal and individual good. But they are capable of being divorced and arrayed against each other, and of thus producing universal disruption and anarchy. Not only this capability, but a limitless liability of its being exercised, necessarily belongs to moral agents. The danger is, not that their social tendencies will wrest and carry them away from the influence of the personal ones, and thus divorce them from due regard to their own happiness, although this is a possible case; but that the personal ones will wrest and carry them away from the just influence of the social ones, and thus divorce them from the regard they owe to the universal happiness. This danger is immeasurably great, and it arises from, and is founded in, the very constitution of their being as it came from their Maker's hands. Had they been so constituted as to be incapable of happiness, they could not have been moral beings, and could have sustained no moral or social relations to each other. As they could have had nothing for which to hope, nothing to fear, nothing to choose or desire, all objects and conditions must have been alike indifferent to them; existence itself could have had no value in their eyes. It is obvious, therefore, that it was necessary to constitute them so that they would naturally thirst for happiness as intensely as for existence itself, in order, first, that each of them might set the highest possible value on his own existence and the means and measures essential to its well-being; and, secondly, that he might have within himself an omnipotent standard by

which to value the existence and well-being of others throughout the universe. But, when we remember the following facts: 1. that, while each thus thirsts for his own happiness, *his* possession or want of it, is a direct personal experience, the master fact of his consciousness, the ever-present spring of his activity respecting himself; whereas, unaided by supernatural revelation or illustration, he can only know and realize the possession or want of it by others, even when he witnesses the manifestation by them of the one or the other, through the recognition of their common nature and the inference, however spontaneous, that it must be the same to them as to himself; 2. that the number of his fellow beings whom he can personally know, and whose happiness or misery he can personally witness and be directly affected by, must be exceedingly limited, even if his intelligence be of the utmost finite capacity; and 3. that God has recorded in his Word that holy beings did fall, which must have resulted, as the record more than intimates, and the nature of the case makes sure, from the influence of the personal tendency in them; we say, when we remember these facts, the conclusion we are compelled to draw from them is, that the force of the *natural* attraction, by which each moral agent is drawn to set his heart on and seek his own happiness, is necessarily greater than that by which he is drawn to set his heart on and seek the universal happiness. If this conclusion be valid, it is obvious that it furnishes an explanation altogether additional to that furnished by the fact of the intensely social nature of moral agents, why it is that the example of *selfishness* (i. e. of sin), once set, has such appalling potency to extend itself among them; and why it is necessary to array the strongest possible motives against it.

Taking, now, all the facts and principles and conclusions of this whole argument together, what do they constitute less than a moral demonstration that there is an absolute necessity, in order to conserve and promote the greatest possible amount of virtue and happiness in the universe, for adding motives in favor of virtue and against sin to those found in the natural consequences of each, and for adding as great ones as possible? The truth is, the more tremendous the natural consequences of sin are, so much the more urgent is the necessity that a positive moral government, with positive rewards and penalties should be instituted and administered; and the only way in which it is possible for any one to show that there is no necessity for such

a government, is, to show that sin produces no natural evil consequences whatever! Instead, therefore, of the fact that sin does produce such evil natural consequences, as we see, being any ground for concluding against the doctrine of positive penalties, additional to them, it compels the conclusion, not only that there must be such penalties, but that, if God is benevolent, they must be just as severe as possible. He, and he alone, can institute and administer a positive moral government for all his intelligent creatures; and this whole argument shows that, if he really wills their highest virtue and happiness, he must have done this; he must have added positive rewards and positive penalties to the natural consequences of obedience and disobedience; he must have made the penalties as severe as possible; and that, if he has not done this, his benevolence cannot be vindicated; he must be regardless of the welfare of his intelligent creatures.

III. We urge against this doctrine, in the next place, that, if it be true, God cannot be *just*. This position is already substantially established by what has been advanced under the preceding objection; but it seems important to give it some additional consideration and illustration.

The general idea of justice is, that *it consists in rendering to all their dues*. As an attribute, it is the disposition or will to do this; as an act or exercise, it is actually doing it. As it relates to government, this general idea of justice branches into two specific varieties. One of these is *distributive justice*. Its realization would consist in distributing to every subject of the government, such rewards or punishment as his conduct *deserves*. It respects exclusively the actual *merit or demerit* of each person, and deals with him accordingly. The other of the varieties is *public justice*. Its realization consists in protecting the rights and promoting the welfare of all the subjects of the government, by such legislation and such an administration of law as their highest good demands. The difference between these two species of justice is, that the latter demands the infliction of the penalties deserved by transgressors solely for the sake of protecting and promoting the highest good of the public; and hence, if that good can be secured as effectually in some other way, as by punishing the guilty, it dismisses its claims against them, and even demands that mercy shall extend them a pardon on condition of their return to obedience; while the former demands that the penalties deserved

by transgressors shall be inflicted on them, simply because they deserve them, and irrespective of the general good; and hence, it insists with relentless rigor that no pardon shall be extended, and no mercy shown, to the violator of the law in any instance, and that he shall suffer to the extreme of his ill-desert.

Now, that public justice cannot be satisfied, in other words, that the well-being of the intelligent universe cannot be secured and promoted to the highest possible degree, by any measure of punishment less than is demanded by distributive justice, is demonstrated by what we have already shown respecting the appalling potency of sin to propagate itself and its resulting misery throughout the universe, and respecting the consequent necessity that the strongest possible motives (i. e. legal sanctions) should be arrayed against it and in favor of virtue. While, therefore, *public justice* furnishes the grand and only imperative reason for the infliction of punishment, *distributive justice* must, in a perfect government, and of course in that of God, be, in every case, the *rule* or *measure* of the infliction. Hence, if sin deserves only its own natural consequences, public justice, if we can conceive it to exist at all in such a case, would require that these, and these only, should be endured by its perpetrator; but if, notwithstanding these, it deserves positive punishment, then public justice demands that its perpetrator shall be made to suffer it according to the measure of the ill-desert.

Are, then, the natural consequences of sin all that it deserves? Sure we are that neither conscience nor reason, to say nothing about revelation, answers this question in the affirmative. Sure we are that, when they beget in the guilty "a fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries," it is by generating within them the conviction that they deserve a *positive* retribution from God. And sure we are that, when the guilty are writhing under this appalling conviction, it would give them great relief to be certified of its falseness, and that the natural consequences of their sin are alone to be feared. It is certain that some of these very consequences, and these among the most tormenting, consist precisely in, and result from, spontaneous anticipations of positive retribution, to be inflicted by God himself. This goes to prove, that it is an original, untaught affirmation or sentiment of the minds of moral agents, that sin deserves such retribution; and this is further proved by the fact that all human legislators, and governments,

and the mass of mankind, in every age and nation, have recognized the principle, as an unquestionable truth, in all their laws, their penal inflictions, and their manifestations of belief.

But, besides this, the nature of the case demonstrates that the natural consequences of sin are not all that it deserves. In order to see this, let us view it in the light of the relation to a human government, sustained by one who has committed crime. As a member of society, enjoying its protection and privileges, he owed it a life of social rectitude; of order, justice and good-will. By his crime, he has not only defrauded it of what he owed it, but he has done it direct injury by assailing its security and welfare. Now, to assert that the natural consequences of his crime are all that he deserves for it, is to assert that society has no *right* to punish him; for the necessary condition of inflicting punishment on any one, is, that he deserves it. If he does not, the infliction is not punishment, but injustice and outrage. Of course, then, society has no power to protect itself against future aggressions committed by him or by others, incited, it may be, by his example, even were its very existence at stake. Who can fail to see how utterly destructive of all government and all social order among men; how perfectly demoralizing, anarchical and pernicious; and how absolutely at war with the spontaneous sentiment and corresponding practice of mankind, this doctrine is, when considered simply as it applies to the relation of the perpetrator of crime to human society? And, on the contrary, who can fail to see, that, as a defrauder and injurer of society, he deserves punishment *from* it; that he deserves it according to the measure of what he knew, or might have known or supposed, to be his obligation to live a virtuous citizen; and that, therefore, society has the *right*, and is *bound*, to inflict on him such penalties as, in its best wisdom, it really believes, viewing his whole course as it may, its own welfare (i. e. public justice) demands? If all this be not so, the whole idea of justice is not only a dream, but one from the ivory gate.

Applying this, now, to the relation between all sinners and the government of God, we say it is all true in a transcendently higher sense; for all sin is crime against him and the universal society over which he presides. Whether crime does or does not deserve punishment from human government, for the same radical reasons — reasons, however, involving infinitely higher considerations — sin does or does not deserve punishment from

the Divine government. If the natural consequences of sin are all that the transgressor deserves, it is just as true respecting the one government as the other; and, as, if such be the fact, neither would have a right to inflict punishment, should either do so, it would of course be unjust and tyrannical.¹ But if crime, as a fraud and an outrage against the society embraced under a human government, renders its perpetrator deserving of punishment from it; and if he deserves it according to the measure already stated; for the same reasons, infinitely amplified, sin, as a fraud and an outrage against God and universal society, renders its perpetrator deserving of punishment from the Divine government; and the measure, according to which he deserves it, is the measure of what he knew, or might have known or supposed, to be his obligation to live a holy life. Consequently, if a human government has the right, and is bound, to inflict punishment on a criminal, as stated, seeing he deserves it; for the same reason, infinitely augmented, God has the *right*, and is *bound* by his own moral attributes, to inflict punishment on all unforgiven sinners, as the good of the universal society over which he presides (i. e. public justice), demands. We have omitted the word *positive*, before the word *punishment*, in this argument from the nature of the case, because governmental punishment is necessarily *positive*, and the very point of the argument is to show that sin deserves punishment from government, both human and Divine.

Now, as there is no evidence whatever that sin does not deserve positive punishment, what has been advanced in this whole argument, taken together, must be regarded as constituting a moral demonstration that it does, and that public justice (i. e. the welfare of universal society) demands, that, unless it can be satisfied in some other way, such punishment shall be inflicted on all sinners to the full measure of their ill-desert. And, as we presume no one will deny that it is *due* from God to moral beings, both as their Creator and as their Ruler, that he should do all that is, in the nature of the case, possible, to secure their well-being, we deem the conclusion inevitable that, if he has not

¹ Logical consistency demands that the advocates of non-resistance and of freedom from all government, should accept this doctrine of natural consequences, and that the adherents of this doctrine should be advocates of non-resistance and of freedom from all government; for the radical principle is the same, and must apply to the Divine and human governments alike.

instituted a positive government, and has not attached to his law a positive penalty, as severe as strict distributive justice requires, but has left the mere natural consequences of sin to be the only evil results of sinning, it is impossible to vindicate his justice any more than his benevolence (he must be unjust, and if unjust at all, infinitely so), he has not done, and is not doing what is due from him to his creatures and subjects, to secure their well-being. "Sparing justice feeds iniquity."

Thus far we have said nothing respecting either the nature or duration of the punishment God will inflict on sinners. As to its nature, we wish to say nothing here; but as to its duration, we deem it important to append a few words. We hold, then, that, to be *just*, it must be *endless*. All our argument proves, that, if sin *deserves* endless punishment, both justice and benevolence demand its infliction on all sinners not saved by Christ. The question, then, is, "does sin deserve it?" and this question we answer in the affirmative. We believe this to be the doctrine of both *reason* and *revelation*. Omitting all proof from the latter, we invite attention to one mode in which it is established by the former. Suppose, then, one has committed an intended wrong, it matters not how grave or how slight, against another. Can he forthwith demand, *as his right*, that the wronged one, or any other one cognizant of the fact, shall regard and treat him as if he had not done the wrong? Can he assert that he deserves no retribution for the wrong? Can he do so the next day, or week, or month, or year? Will the lapse of any number of years, or myriads of ages, have the slightest effect to obliterate or diminish the guilt of that deed, or to restore the right it forfeited? We believe reason can only give an affirmative response to these questions. No lapse of time can have any tendency to destroy or impair the ill-desert of sin. No more can the endurance of any punishment which has an end. Neither the one, nor the other, can undo the act, or change its quality of ill-desert. Nor can repentance. Whatever punishment, therefore, he deserves at the moment of its commission, he necessarily deserves forever; and consequently, if he shall ever be restored to the favor of the wronged one, or of the wronged universe, or of God, the wronged Ruler of the universe, and treated by either of them as if he had not sinned, it must be by *grace and forgiveness* on their part, and not on the ground of justice. Distributive justice would treat him forever according to his guilt, and so must

public justice if he be not graciously forgiven. Nor is anything in the course of human governments which seems to conflict with this, any objection to what must be true in the government of God which is infinitely perfect. Hence, if God does not inflict perpetual punishment on all sinners who have not received grace through the atonement, he can be neither benevolent nor just.

IV. We urge against this doctrine, in the next place, that, if it be true, an atonement is impossible. An atonement, in the nature of the case, must be a governmental measure, and must relate to governmental ends and penalties. Its object and adaptation must be to secure and promote the grand end of public justice, at least, as fully as would the punishment of those for whom it is made; in other words, in its practical influence and effect on universal mind, it must be a complete *substitute* for the punishment due to sinners *from* the Divine government, in such a sense, that as many of them as avail themselves of it, according to the terms prescribed, can, in full accordance with the demands of public justice, be pardoned and restored to all the immunities and privileges of those who have never sinned. There can be *no* propitiation or expiation for sin which is not, in this sense, a perfect substitute for its punishment. Such a substitute, we believe the atonement of Christ to be. We believe that, in respect to those who avail themselves of it, it secures and promotes the grand end of public justice far more perfectly than their punishment could. It would do the same for all, if all would embrace it; and it is sincerely offered to all. God, therefore, is not only *just*, but infinitely *wise and benevolent* in providing it, and in pardoning sin on the ground of it; and for it, not the earth only, but the universe should resound with his praise.

But such a measure can only consist with a positive government and positive penalties; for it is plainly impossible in the nature of the case to make any kind of a substitute for the natural consequences of sin; just as impossible as it would be to make one for personal identity. Being *natural*, they can of course only be superseded or removed by destroying the *nature* of those who suffer them. How, then, would it be possible to substitute the sufferings of Christ for them? When triangles become circles, this may be done. But further; as an atonement is, in its very nature, a governmental measure, adopted to satisfy public justice instead of the punishment of those for whom

it is made; and as, if the doctrine of natural consequences be true, there is no government that can adopt such a measure, and no public justice that can be satisfied by it, or at all admit of it, it is of course among the most absolutely impossible things. The death of Christ could, therefore, at best, have been nothing more than that of a martyr; it must have been that of an impostor. Hence, logical consistency demands that all who adopt this theory, should, as most of them do, discard the doctrine of the cross, should incontinently denounce and spurn this theory as its deadly enemy, and in all its aspects an abomination.

V. Another objection to this doctrine is, that, if it be true, there can be no pardon or forgiveness of sin. Pardon consists in arresting and setting aside the deserved penalty of law. But, as the natural consequences of sin are necessary, to talk of arresting and setting them aside, is as absurd as to talk of arresting and setting aside the natural consequences of putting out an eye, fracturing a limb, or sinking in the midst of the sea beyond recovery. The advocates of this theory are therefore perfectly consistent, in rejecting, as they generally do, the doctrine of justification by faith. They can logically do nothing else. Pardon, forgiveness, justification, mercy, are all utterly unmeaning terms in their system, unless they define them, as one of them with whom we once conversed, defined forgiveness, to mean *reform!* *punishment*, on the same principle, would mean *making sinners sin on!* Absurd as these definitions are, they are the only ones the system admits; so that it subverts, not only the ideas, but the very language of Christianity. Indeed, the whole class of terms mentioned must be blotted from the vocabulary of the nations, and also the ideas they express from their minds, and new ones must be supplied in their room, before this sublime theory can hold full ascendancy over the world.

VI. Against this doctrine, we urge, in the next place, that its tendency is intrinsically *demoralizing*. By setting aside the doctrine of a positive moral government, it sweeps away, of course, all the motives it contains in its proffered rewards and threatened penalties, which deter from sin and prompt to virtue, leaving those only which are found in the seen or apprehended natural consequences of obedience and sin. Those left, are not worthy to be compared with those taken away, in power to excite hope and fear and consequently to urge moral agents to, and uphold them in, rectitude. Their estimate of the importance of

the precept of the Divine Law, and of obedience to it, must be proportionally lowered, and their conception of the evil of sin correspondingly defective. Their sense of responsibility; their fear of, and reverence for, God; their dread of his justice; their felt need of his mercy; and their appreciation of his benevolent regard for the welfare of his creatures, must all be diminished to suit the measure of this most narrow theory, as Milton's fallen angels shrunk from "their shapes immense," to "less than smallest dwarfs," to find a place in Pandemonium. What, then, can possibly result, if this doctrine gains general credence among men, but a fearful augmentation of irreligion, vice and crime? The virtue of such as are virtuous, must be weakened, and the depravity of such as are depraved, must find relief from restraint and be strengthened. Nor is this all. By setting aside, as it must, the doctrine of atonement with all its logical issues and implications, it also sweeps away all the motives contained in it and them, which restrain from sin and allure to piety; which, in the hands of the Divine Spirit, are the power of God and the wisdom of God for the renovation of the world. These removed, all that remains of Christ the Divine, is Christ the man with his teachings and example. Impotent indeed must his teachings and example prove, when thus dis severed from the fact of atonement and from the fact of a moral government, since, even when connected with these, their force is ineffectual with such multitudes; and the more impotent must they prove, after such dissociation, because by it God is removed from the nearness of a direct personal agency in rewarding and punishing, to the measureless distance of a mere Creator. Against the force of the attractions and impulses which propel our race to sin, they can only be as dikes of sand against the surges of the ocean, rolled up into mountains and driven on by all the strength of mightiest storms. Sooner, therefore, might we expect the ever-frozen regions of the Arctic zone to produce, amidst all their rigors, the various growths and fruits of the tropics, than this doctrine, universally believed or realized in fact, to conserve piety or virtue in our world. Nay, it is surcharged with a virus adequate to paralyze and subvert the rectitude of the angelic hosts and saints redeemed, in heaven itself, could they but give it credence.

VII. We finally object to this doctrine that, while, as the whole tenor of this Article shows, it has no basis whatever in reason or the nature of things, it has none in the Word of God.

Where does that Word say or intimate that the natural consequences of sin are the only punishment it will receive? Where does it say or intimate that, if sinners in hell should repent at any period in the future, they would of course, or at all, be from that time released from their sufferings? Where does it say or intimate that the reason they will suffer there endlessly, is because they will sin endlessly? It contains no such sayings or intimations **any more** than it contains the Papal dream of Purgatory. On the contrary, it teaches most explicitly that, in the future world, God will himself inflict positive punishment on the wicked; that it will be for the sin they committed in this life, "the deeds done in the body," and that it will be according to those deeds; i. e. it will be severe in proportion to the aggregate of each one's ill-desert. Whatever sin they may commit in the future state, during the progress of the ages, it gives not the slightest intimation whether he will inflict any additional punishment on them for it or not.

But, besides its manifold and various teachings to this effect, it informs us that, in this world, God has repeatedly inflicted positive punishment on the presumptuous or desperately wicked. The destruction of the old world by the flood; the overthrow of the cities of the plain; the plagues of Egypt, and the drowning of Pharaoh and his hosts in the Red Sea; the fire that went out from God and consumed so many of the Israelites in the wilderness; the swallowing up by the earth of Korah, Dathan and Abiram; the plague that followed, and cut off fourteen thousand and seven hundred; the destruction of the hosts of Sennacherib in one night; the falling dead of Ananias and Sapphira; and many other similar events recorded for our ensamples, are all instances of this kind. Respecting all these, we say, that, if a positive government and positive penalties are inconsistent with the benevolence of God, so were they; and, oh the contrary, that, if they were consistent with his benevolence, so, for the same radical reasons infinitely augmented, are such a government and such penalties. It is certain that, if the natural consequences of sin are all it deserves, and all that public justice demands, such cases must be regarded as injustice and cruelty.

Such are our objections to this theory; and, deeming it unnecessary to recapitulate them, it only remains for us to add a few concluding suggestions.

In the first place, we wish to caution any one from inferring

from the course our argument has taken, that we think lightly of the natural consequences of sin. On the contrary, we think them terrible. No one, it is certain, has ever in the present state realized fully how heavy they must sit upon the soul, when their whole weight, unrelieved by a single diversion of mind, a single self-delusion, or the slightest obscuration of the nature and bearings of sin, shall rest down upon it in eternity. Who can tell us, how much is really meant by the single word *remorse*, as it will then be understood, when it is remembered what a fearful significance it sometimes acquires, even in this life? Nor does the Bible speak of them lightly, but with many stern and frightful utterances. Nevertheless, appalling as they are, they are but the rudiments and preludes of that transcendently more tremendous retribution which God himself will inflict, when, at the behest both of infinite benevolence and infinite justice, "he will render to every man according to his works."

Nor does it require great discernment to see, that, if a positive punishment awaits the wicked in eternity, the natural consequences of sin will themselves, for that very reason, be proportionally more severe than if no such punishment is to be added to them. Indeed, if the latter supposition be true, they must prove comparatively trivial, and will be easily borne; so that to reject the doctrine of a positive punishment, is virtually to reject, in great part, and that far the most formidable, the doctrine of natural consequences itself. It is to reduce them to mere shadows of themselves. The reader will readily pardon us, if we here introduce the sixth of Wordsworth's Sonnets upon the punishment of death, in which this principle, as it relates to human government, is admirably set forth:

"Ye brood of conscience — Spectres! that frequent
The bad man's restless walk, and haunt his bed —
Fiends in your aspect, yet beneficent
In act, as hovering Angels when they spread
Their wings to guard the unconscious Innocent —
Slow be the Statutes of the land to share
A laxity that could not but impair
Your power to punish crime, and so prevent.
And ye, Beliefs! coiled serpent-like about
The adage on all tongues, 'Murder will out,'
How shall your ancient warnings work for good
In the full might they hitherto have shown,
If for deliberate shedder of man's blood
Survive not Judgment that requires his own!"

✓ In the next place, we deem it important to say here, that, if it is inconsistent with the benevolence of God to inflict positive punishment for sin, it must, for the same essential reason, be inconsistent with it to connect by creation natural sufferings with violations of moral law. In the latter case, although the sufferings proceed from the nature of moral agents, and would do so if God were not, provided they could continue to exist, nevertheless he is their ultimate cause, as the Author of that nature, and is therefore as really responsible for them as he is in the former case. Consequently, as the objection, that it is inconsistent with the benevolence of God and unjust for him to inflict positive punishment for sin, can only be urged on the ground, consciously or unconsciously assumed, that benevolence and justice forbid that *he* should cause moral beings to suffer at all, it must be just as valid (or invalid), against creating them with such constitutions that, if they commit sin, it will naturally produce suffering; for he causes the suffering in the one case as really as in the other. Hence, if those who urge this objection wish to be consistent, we advise them to take the ground its principle demands, and the only one it admits, that God ought so to have constituted moral agents, that, do what they might, they would be happy; in other words, that he should have given them, not only no *moral* constitution, but no constitution at all; for a constitution must have laws, and if it have laws, to violate them must produce misery. Even brutes must suffer, if they violate the laws of their nature.

But, besides all this, this objection is forestalled by the consideration, that, neither in creating moral agents, nor in instituting and administering a positive government over them, does God aim at their misery, but at directly the opposite. To be capable of happiness, they must be *moral* agents; to be such, they must be free; to be free, they must be liable to sin; to sin, is to war against their own nature and universal well-being; and to war against these, renders it necessary for them to endure both the natural and the governmental consequences of so doing. These consequences are alike intrinsically adapted and ordained to restrain them from sin and to conserve and promote their virtue and happiness. If, in their freedom, they sin despite these, and thus involve themselves in their tormentings, the fault, most assuredly, can no more be charged against God, than the endurance by criminals of the penalties due to their crimes, can be

charged, as a fault, against the human government which inflicts them.

"Not man alone, all rationals, heav'n arms
With an illustrious, but tremendous pow'r
To counteract its own most gracious ends;
And this, of strict necessity, not choice:
That pow'r denied, men, angels, were no more
But passive engines, void of praise or blame.
A nature rational implies the pow'r
Of being blest, or wretched, as we please;
Else idle reason would have nought to do:
And he that would be barr'd capacity
Of pain, courts incapacity of bliss."

Before closing, we wish to point to the bearing of all we have said, on the doctrine that punishment is *disciplinary*; a doctrine which rests on a basis cognate to that of the one we have been opposing, and is equally crude. Punishment (i. e. the governmental infliction of deserved penalties), is aimed exclusively, as we think has been made apparent, at protecting and upholding the universal or public good, which has been assailed and injured by those upon whom it is inflicted; and hence, just as much as that good requires, so much must they be punished, irrespective of any conceivable amendatory effect it may have on them. If, therefore, all the lost should, at some future period, repent and become as holy as the angels, it could have no effect whatever to release them from their sufferings, so far as they are the result of governmental penalties, however it might arrest or mitigate the natural consequences of their sin. To say that punishment is disciplinary, is really a contradiction in terms and in sense, and is virtually to say that God has no moral government; and to say this, is to stand in the presence-chamber of Atheism.

ARTICLE III.

THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, AND
THE REASONS FOR THEIR EXCLUSION FROM THE CANON
OF SCRIPTURE.

By C. E. Stowe, D. D., Professor at Andover.

I. THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE books pertaining to the Old Testament which the Romish church holds to be sacred and canonical, in addition to the original Hebrew canon, are the following: *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Wisdom*, *Sirach*, *Baruch*, *Maccabees I and II*, *additions to Daniel*, *additions to Esther*. Besides these, there are generally printed, as an appendix to the Vulgate, the Prayer of Manasseh, and Esdras III. and IV. In the English Apocrypha these two books of Esdras are designated as I. and II. The reason of the Vulgate numeration is, that the canonical Esdras is in that translation called Esdras I., and the canonical Nehemiah, Esdras II. In this it differs from the Septuagint, which retains for Nehemiah the Hebrew canonical name.

Before the time of the Council of Trent, the books above mentioned had not been received as canonical by the Christian church; most of them had been positively and very pointedly condemned by some one or more of the eminent church fathers; those who had received them to be read in churches made a marked distinction between them and the books of the original Hebrew canon, assigning to them a much lower place; and those who called any of them canonical, generally assigned the most trivial and unsatisfactory reasons for so doing. For example, Hilary (Proleg. in Psalm.) mentions, that the Hebrews had twenty-two canonical books of the Old Testament corresponding to the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet; but as the Greeks have twenty-four letters in their alphabet, they ought to have twenty-four books in their Old Testament canon, and he, therefore, in order to make out the number twenty-four, would add to the Hebrew canon the books of Tobit and Judith, for the Greek Bible. According to this principle, the Old Testament for the Arabs, Ethiopians, Cherokees, and many other nations,

ought to be enlarged by a number of books greater than all the apocryphal writings, numerous as they are, would be able to supply. Augustine, though the greatest man of his time intellectually, was a very poor critical scholar. He was disposed to receive all the books usually included in the Septuagint as canonical, because he ignorantly supposed that the Septuagint as a whole had the sanction of the apostles (*quae etiam ab Apostolis approbata est.*—*Epist.* 32. *ad Hieron.* n. 35); yet, though he called all the Septuagint books canonical, he made a marked distinction among them in respect to their authority. He says: *In canonicis Scripturis ecclesiarum catholicarum quamplurimum auctoritatem sequatur, ut eas, quae ab omnibus accipiuntur ecclesiis catholicis, praeponat eas, quas quaedam non accipiunt. In eis vero, quae non accipiuntur ab omnibus, praeponat eas, quae plures gravioresque accipiunt.*—*Doctr. Christ.* II. 3. Here is license enough for the most liberal Protestant; and it is by such statements as these that Jahn and other enlightened Roman Catholic scholars endeavor to vindicate the Council of Trent for their decree respecting the canon, on the ground that there was an understood and admitted distinction among the sacred books between the *deutero-canonical* and the *proto-canonical*. If Augustine and some other fathers made such a distinction, it is clear enough that the Council of Trent did not.

Jerome was greatly superior to Augustine in scholarship, so far as a critical knowledge of languages and books is concerned, though greatly inferior in almost all other respects. Jerome knew that the apocryphal books had no claim to canonical authority, and he said so very plainly, and when exasperated by opposition, very bitterly. He in one place declares: *Sapientia, quae vulgo Salomonis inscribitur, et Jesu Sirach liber, et Judith et Tobias et Pastor non sunt in canone.* In another place he says of these books very sharply: *Apocryphorum naenias mortuis magis haeticis quam ecclesiasticis vivis canendas.*—*Proleg. Gal. et Prol. in Com. Matt.* Augustine was often at variance with Jerome, as the theologian is apt to be at variance with the scholar. He strongly condemned Jerome's Latin translation of the Old Testament, because it varied so much from the Septuagint; though it departed from the Septuagint only by coming nearer to the divine original in the Hebrew; but Augustine was not scholar enough to know or appreciate a fact of this kind. (Compare Marheinecke's *Symbolik*, Band II. S. 224, ff. first edition, 1810.)

This is a subject of deep interest at the present time. Romanists among us are continually objecting to our Bible, calling it a *mutilated* Bible and furiously resisting, wherever they can, its introduction into schools and families. In the following pages, we shall give a review of the debates and decisions on this subject in the Council of Trent, that the reader may see on what very shallow and insufficient grounds that decision was made on which so much was depending; and then we shall show the grounds on which we pronounce that decision to be totally wrong, by exhibiting in full the reasons why the books in question ought to be excluded from the canon of Scripture. The following is a summary of the points which will be stated and proved in the ensuing discussion:

(1) These books never had the sanction of Christ or his apostles or of any of the writers of the New Testament.

(2) They formed no part of the original Hebrew canon, and were not written till after inspiration had ceased and the canon was closed.

(3) They were rejected with singular unanimity by the early Christian churches and by the best of the church fathers.

(4) The books themselves, examined individually, can be proved, each one by itself, to be unworthy of a place in the canon of Scripture.

Under this last head we shall give, in regard to each book: (a) a description of the book; (b) we shall examine its internal evidence in regard to its having a place in the canon, and (c) state the external testimony in respect to it.

II. DEBATES AND DECISIONS IN THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

The Council of Trent for its fourth session, which was held in the spring of the year 1546, collected several propositions respecting the Scriptures from the writings of Luther, which they alleged to be erroneous. These propositions were earnestly discussed in the several congregations which preceded the session; as was also the question, whether canons with anathemas annexed, in the usual manner, should be issued against these errors. Two of the alleged errors were these: (a) That no books ought to be received into the canon of the Old Testament except those which were found in the original Hebrew canon, and (b) That the original text, the Hebrew for the Old

Testament and the Greek for the New, is the only ultimate appeal as the pure word of God, and that the Latin Vulgate used in the churches, abounds in erroneous translations. We give not the words but only the substance, because it is only with these two points that we are concerned in the present discussion; and it would lead us too far out of our track to follow the exact order and method of the treatment of the several topics in the council. We propose to give, and that too in a very condensed form, only what pertains to the Old Testament canon, and the authority of the Latin Vulgate as compared with the original text.

In regard to the canon, they were generally agreed, that a catalogue of the sacred books should be made out, after the example of the ancients; and that all the books usually read in the Roman churches should be admitted into it, and that the Old Testament canon should not be limited to those books only which were received by the Hebrews. The catalogues of the Council of Laodicea, of Pope Innocent I., of the third Council of Carthage, and of Pope Gelasius, were proposed as models. As to the form of the catalogue there were four opinions: (1) Some proposed that the books should be separated into two divisions, the first of which should consist of those only which had always and without dispute been regarded as canonical, the *ὁμολογούμενων* of Eusebius; and the second, of those which had been by some rejected, and in regard to which there was more or less of doubt, the *ἀντιλεγόμενων*. (Compare Euseb. Hist. Eccl. III. 25.) They argued that, though this distinction had not been formally and expressly recognized by any pope or council, yet it had been in fact tacitly and universally acknowledged; that Augustine makes this distinction, and that it is received, and the authority of Augustine in respect to it confirmed by the Canon *in canonicis*. Gregory, also, who lived after Gelasius, declares, in his Exposition of Job, that the Books of Maccabees were written for edification and adapted to it, but yet they were not canonical.

Aloysius of Catanea, a Dominican Friar, affirmed that this distinction was made by Jerome, and that the church had accepted it as the rule and standard for establishing the canon of the Holy Scriptures. He also quoted Cardinal Cajetan, who, following Jerome, had made the same distinction, and, in the dedication to Clement VII. of his treatise on the historical books

of the Old Testament, had declared it to be a settled principle of the church.

(2) A second proposition was, that the books should be arranged, not in two, but three divisions, the first to consist of those which had always and without contradiction been received as Divine; the second, those which had sometimes been doubted, but whose canonical authority had at length been confirmed by the usage of the church, to which class belong certain epistles and the Apocalypse of the New Testament, and some few passages in the evangelists; and the third division should consist of those books which had never been esteemed canonical, to which class belong *the seven apocryphal books of the Old Testament, and the passages of Daniel and Esther which are not found in the Hebrew text.*

(3) The third opinion was, that there should be no distinction made among the books, but after the example of the Council of Carthage and other synods, they should merely make out the catalogue and offer no remarks upon it.

(4) The fourth proposal was this: that all the books in all their parts, just as they stand in the Latin Bible, should be declared equally of divine authority. The book of Baruch here made no little difficulty, for this book was not to be found in the catalogues of the Laodicean or the Carthaginian councils, nor yet in those made by the Roman pontiffs; and therefore it ought to be excluded, both for this reason and because the beginning of the book is wanting. Yet, because some lessons in the church books were taken from it, the members of the council could not be persuaded to relinquish its canonical authority; and they therefore resolved that it must have been regarded by the ancients as a part of the book of Jeremiah, and received by them into the canon under the name of that prophet. Thus their opinion of what the fact ought to have been, determined them to assume the fact itself, without evidence. A summary and convenient mode of proceeding, which has often been followed, both in ecclesiastical and other assemblies.

On the eighth of March, 1546, there was held an extraordinary congregation, in which it was unanimously resolved, that church tradition should be held of equal authority with the written word of God. With respect to the form in which they should put forth their catalogue of the canonical Scriptures, the theologians still entertained various opinions. One was, that the indi-

vidual books need not be mentioned by name; another, that the books ought to be divided into three classes; and a third, that all the books of the Latin Bible should be placed in one rank as of equal authority. In this diversity of opinions it was agreed, that catalogues should be made out according to the three different proposals, and laid before the next congregation for examination; and then it should be decided which of the three should be adopted.

In the congregation of the fifteenth of March, the three catalogues were actually presented; each had its advocates; but the third was the one which triumphed. In the subsequent congregations, the authority of the Latin translation was discussed; and here arose a hot conflict between the few who had some knowledge of the Greek language and a good understanding of the Latin, and the many who knew nothing of the one and but little of the other. The Dominican Aloysius of Catanea here again made himself heard. He remarked, that, in regard to this matter, nothing could be better in itself or more wisely adapted to the times than the principle asserted by Cardinal Cajetan, that justly celebrated divine, who from his early youth had devoted himself to the study of theology, and with a happy talent and unwearied diligence, which had made him the most distinguished in this branch of science of any one for many centuries; insomuch that there was not a prelate or doctor in the whole council who need be ashamed to confess himself his inferior and pupil in point of learning. This great prelate, when he went to Germany in 1523, to hold his conference with Luther, being led to study earnestly the best means of reuniting the dismembered church and bringing the heretics to a confession of their errors, concluded that the only effective method must be a critical understanding of the Holy Scriptures in their original languages. Accordingly, during all the rest of his life, full eleven years, he devoted himself entirely to the study of the Scriptures, and wrote his expositions upon them, not according to the Latin translation, but according to the original text, the Hebrew for the Old Testament, and the Greek for the New; and, forasmuch as he was not himself skilled in these tongues, he employed men thoroughly acquainted with them to translate for him literally, word for word, as is abundantly manifest from his works on the sacred books. This excellent cardinal was wont to say, that to understand the Latin text was not necessarily to understand the word

of God; the word of God is infallible, but the Latin translators may have made mistakes. On this account, also, Jerome justly said, that to prophesy and write holy books is the gift of God's Spirit; but to translate these books from one language to another is matter of human skill. In reference to these words, Cajetan often said with a sigh: "Oh that the teachers of former times had been of this opinion, and then the Lutheran heresy would not have arisen." Cataneus further declared, that the Latin translation could not be received as authoritative without violating the canon *Ut Veterum*, etc., *dist.* 9, where it is asserted that the truth of the Old Testament is to be sought in the Hebrew text, and that of the New in the Greek. To declare the one translation authentic, would be to condemn Jerome and all the others; for as these cannot be authentic, no further use can be made of them. A miserable business it would be, in a conflict with opponents, to select a text doubtful and not generally acknowledged, when one is in possession of the genuine and infallible text, which ensures a certain victory. With Jerome and Cajetan we must consider it certain that there is no translator, whatever care he may exercise, who may not sometimes fall into a mistake. If the holy council itself would undertake a translation, and examine and improve it by the original text, then it might not be doubted that the Holy Spirit, which guides all church councils in matters of faith, would so aid the fathers of the synod, that no error would be committed. A translation examined and established in this manner might safely be deemed authentic; but without such an investigation the synod ought not to venture to approve a translation or assure itself of the aid of the Holy Ghost. In the council of the apostles themselves there was a thorough investigation of the matters before them previous to a decision. But as such an investigation in this matter would require a ten years' labor, he thought it best that the affair should be left as it had been for fifteen hundred years past.

The greater part of the theologians were opposed to these views. They argued that the translation which had so long been received and used in the churches and the schools, must of necessity be declared authentic; otherwise, the Lutherans had already gained their point and the door was thrown open to endless heresies and unappeasable disturbances. The popes and the scholastic theologians had for the most part founded the

doctrines of the Romish church, which was the mother of all churches, on certain passages of Scripture; and now, if there were granted to every one the right to call in question the translation, whether it were correct or not, whether this were done by comparing it with other translations or with the original Hebrew and Greek text, then the linguists and grammarians might bring all into confusion and set up themselves as umpires in matters of faith; and they would be the doctors of theology and of the canon law, and they would have the dignity of bishops and cardinals; and the inquisitors, if they were not skilled in Hebrew and Greek, could no more proceed against the Lutherans, but they would cry out, "it is not so in the original," "the translation is false," and in this manner every school-fox may put forth his novelties and the abortions of his own brain, conceived in wickedness or ignorance, as the true doctrines, and never be at a loss, by some grammatical trick, to find a text to justify them; and thus there would never be an end. Every body knows that Luther's translation of the Bible has brought after it numberless and contradictory heresies, worthy of being condemned to eternal darkness; and that Luther himself is continually changing his own translation, and never publishes a new edition without altering at least a hundred passages. Were such liberty allowed to all who might choose to make use of it, the time would soon come when a Christian would no longer know what to believe.

These views were by the majority received with approbation, and it was furthermore argued that God had given to the Hebrew church an authentic Scripture, and to the Greek an authentic New Testament; and who could affirm, without offence, than the Roman church, more beloved of God than all the rest, should be left without so great a benefaction? Surely there could be no doubt that the same Holy Ghost which first gave these holy books, had also directed to the translation received by the Roman church.

To others it seemed going too far to consider a man a prophet and apostle because he was the translator of a book; and they modified their idea by saying that the translators had not the prophetic and apostolic spirit, but doubtless one very nearly related to it. And should any one hesitate to attribute to them the influences of the Holy Spirit, he must at least allow these influences to the council; and if, therefore, the council should

confirm the Vulgate and pronounce an anathema against those who dared question its authority, then it must be received as infallible, if not through the spirit which guided the translation, yet at least by the Spirit given to the council which had declared it authentic.

Isidor Clarus, a Benedictine abbot, and a scholar well-read in these studies, ventured, in the way of a historical review, to controvert these opinions, and said, that in the most ancient church there were several Greek translations of the Old Testament, which were collected by Origen into one book and arranged side by side in six columns. The principal of these was the Septuagint, from which many Latin translations had been made; and the New Testament also had been many times translated from the Greek into the Latin. Of these translations of the Old and New Testament, the so-called *Itala* found the most favor; and this was generally read in the churches, and was preferred to all the others by Augustine; still it was always held subordinate to the Greek text. When that great linguist, Jerome, became aware that the version of the Old Testament, partly through the fault of the Greek translators, and partly through that of the Latin, was in many places defective, he resolved to make a new translation immediately from the Hebrew, and to improve the version of the New Testament by a careful collation of the original Greek. The celebrity of his name induced many to receive his translations, but many rejected them, partly from attachment to the old and suspicion of the new, and partly, as Jerome himself affirms, out of envy. But after time had abated the bitterness of the envy, the translations of Jerome were received by the Latins very generally, and were used together with the *Itala*, the latter being designated as the *old*, the former as the *new*. Gregory gives testimony to this effect, for in his work on Job he writes to Leander, that the apostolic See received both translations, that in his exposition of Job he had used the new because it came nearest to the Hebrew text, yet in his citations he had sometimes used the one and sometimes the other, just as was most convenient for the purpose in hand. Thus theologians wavering between the two, and using sometimes one and then the other, according to circumstances, they at length combined both into one and gave to this the name of Vulgate. The Psalms, continued Clarus, were retained entire in the old translation, because they, being daily sung in the churches, could not well

be altered. The minor prophets were all in the new translation; the major prophets were in a translation made up of the two. No one can doubt that all this was done in accordance with the Divine will, without which nothing can take place; yet no one can say that the human will was not equally concerned in it. Jerome himself had freely taught that no translator is inspired by the Holy Spirit; and since the Latin Bible which we use is mostly in the translation of Jerome, it seems extravagant to attribute to him the special inspiration of the Holy Ghost, when he himself expressly disclaims it. No translation, therefore, ought to be esteemed of equal authority with the original text. For these reasons, therefore, he would advise that the Vulgate should have the preference over all other editions; that it should be revised and corrected by the original text and then declared to be authentic. If this were done, the other old translations would speedily go out of use, and new ones might be prohibited by a severe edict. Thus all the evils which arise from new translations, and which had been so ably set forth in the preceding congregations, would in a short time pass away.

Andrew de Vega, a Franciscan friar, would mediate between the two extremes. He would allow, with Jerome, that the translator has no prophetic inspiration, nor any gift of the Spirit which renders him infallible; and he would allow, with Jerome and Augustine, that the translation should be examined and corrected by the original text; yet he would add, that these admissions and views need not hinder the church from declaring the Vulgate to be authentic. Such a declaration would imply only that the translation contains no material error in respect to faith and practice, but not, that, in all its expressions and in every shade of meaning, it is equal to the original. No translation can reach to such a degree of accuracy, but must sometimes enlarge and sometimes limit the signification of particular words, and must sometimes avail itself of metaphors and other figures of speech not identical with those in the original. The Vulgate had been in use in the church for a thousand years and upwards, and in this time they had become certain that it contains no material error in respect to faith or practice. The ancient councils had recognized this translation as a sufficient one, and it ought now to be valued according to its worth thus indicated; and it ought to be declared authentic in this sense, that every one might rely on its correctness without hazarding his salvation. Learned

men ought not to be withheld, by any prohibition, from applying themselves to the study of the Hebrew and Greek text; but the new and faulty translations, which bring confusion into the church, ought to be restrained.

The many difficulties urged, did not hinder the fathers from declaring, by almost general consent, the Vulgate translation to be the authentic Bible of the church. Some were so moved by the arguments of the theologians, that they wished the subject might be passed over for the present; but the majority were against it. Still, the proposal was made, and it was at length resolved, that the Vulgate, now declared to be authentic, should be carefully examined and corrected, and a copy made out according to which all others should be printed. Six men were selected for this labor, and they were required to engage in it with all diligence that the work might be published before the close of the council. They reserved to themselves the power of adding to this committee, if, in the course of their sessions, men should be found suited to such an undertaking.

Thus the Vulgate was received as the authentic text, and the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, being a part of it, were received with it as canonical, not because there was any argument in favor of the infallibility of the text or any proof of the canonical authority of these books, for all the argument and all the proof was directly the other way; but simply because the state of things was such, that to seem to question the entire accuracy of the text or the canon of the Vulgate, would occasion great inconvenience and trouble to the dominant party in the Romish church, and put them at a great disadvantage in their controversy with the Protestants. Grammarians and linguists must not presume to know more than bishops and cardinals; well-settled ecclesiastics must not be put to the trouble of learning Hebrew and Greek; the church of the past must not in any respect be put in the wrong, nor must the common people be allowed to lessen their confidence in the teachers set over them in regular succession from the apostles. Whatever might be required by truth and Christian integrity, these things were by no means to be allowed.

There were strong men in that council, well-read and intelligent men, who saw the thing as it was, and labored to set it right; but their voice was lost in the clamor of the multitude, and truth and right availed little against the pressure of an immediate and

urgent self-interest. We are sorry to say, that the Council of Trent is not the only deliberative body which has been swayed in a similar manner; but that there have been abundant examples of the same kind from that day to this, both in ecclesiastical and political assemblies, and among Protestants as well as Catholics.

In regard to the sense of Scripture, the well-known views of Cardinal Cajetan occasioned no little discussion. This prelate had taught, both by precept and example, that a new interpretation of any passage, if it be in accordance with the text and not opposed to other Scriptures, may be received, although the majority of the doctors are against it; for God did not grant the knowledge of Scripture to the ancients alone, otherwise there would be nothing left for posterity or the present generation to do but just to copy the fathers. Some strongly advocated these sentiments of Cajetan, and others opposed them; and, after a warm discussion on both sides, Cardinal Pacheco arose and said, that the Holy Scriptures had already been so well explained by so many pious and learned men, that there was nothing to be added; and that the new interpretations which, from time to time, were brought forward, could give rise only to heresies. He considered it necessary to bridle the insolence of the present age, and hold it in subjection to the fathers and the church; and, if a too bold spirit arise, it must be checked and not allowed to gratify itself and disturb the world by its new revelations. This declaration was vastly pleasing to almost the entire assembly. It is such an easy way of getting rid of difficulty and establishing the truth, that conservative majorities in all generations have been very apt to adopt it.

In the congregation on the twenty-ninth of March, the wording of the decree respecting the Scriptures came up for discussion. To many it seemed rather hard to thunder an anathema against a man, and curse him as a heretic, merely because he could not receive every unimportant passage of the Vulgate as authentic, and had some new view of the interpretation of a text or two of the Holy Scripture. After long discussion, they concluded to make out the catalogue of the sacred books, including the Old Testament Apocrypha, and fortify that with an anathema, as also the authority of church traditions; and then, as to translations and interpretations, they would so frame the decree as to make it a remedy against novelties and impertinent expositions. Thus all the learned men of the Roman Catholic church in all

time were shut up to a reception of the apocryphal books as authentic and canonical, however clearly their investigations might teach them the contrary, and though they knew that these books had been expressly rejected by almost all the saints and fathers of the church, who must therefore be regarded as openly anathematized by the council. The attempt of Jahn, and some other learned Catholics, to escape by classing the books as *proto and deutero-canonical*, is wholly unsuccessful; for, though this distinction was proposed in the council, it was triumphantly overborne by an almost unanimous vote, and all the books included in the Vulgate were placed on a footing of entire equality.

At the close of the congregation, Cardinal Montanus eulogized in high terms the wisdom and learning of the members, and earnestly exhorted them to an orderly and seemly behavior in the public session, and to avoid there all opposition and disputation, inasmuch as the points of difference had all been sufficiently discussed in the several congregations; and it was proper that the public decision should be characterized by harmony and unanimity. After they were dismissed, Cardinal Cervinus privately called together those who had opposed the reception of the Vulgate, and its apocryphal additions to the original canon, as authentic and canonical, and endeavored to pacify them by urging that it was not prohibited but allowed to correct the Vulgate by the original text, and they were only to allege that there were in it no errors of faith so great that it ought to be rejected.

On the eighth of April the public session was held, and the decrees were read in due form. The catalogue includes the whole of the Old Testament Apocrypha, and the decree declares that the synod receives all the books enumerated, with the same affection and reverence, and then proceeds in the following terms: "But if any one shall not receive these same books entire with all their parts, as they are wont to be read in the Catholic church, and the old Latin Vulgate edition, for sacred and canonical, and shall knowingly and intentionally despise the traditions aforesaid, let him be accursed."

This surely is sufficiently explicit; and by this decree the council anathematizes the great body of the saints and fathers of the church, as we shall soon see. The next decree is without the anathema, and the first paragraph is in the following terms: "Moreover, the same holy synod decrees and declares, that this

same old Vulgate edition, which has stood the test of so many ages' use in the church, in public readings, disputings, preachings and expoundings, be deemed authentic, and that no one on any pretext dare or presume to reject it."

Notwithstanding the strenuous opposition to the sentiment of these decrees while under discussion in the congregation, when they were put to vote in the public session, but two voices were heard in opposition or remonstrance. The poor little troublesome bishop of Chiozza alone ventured to say *no*, but prudently added, *perhaps I shall submit (non placet, sed forsân obediám)*. One other member did not approve that traditions should be received *pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia*, but for *pari* he would substitute *summa*. All the others gave an unqualified affirmative.

When these proceedings of the council were made public, there were many, especially in Germany, who expressed themselves very freely in regard to them. Some said it was strange that five cardinals and forty-eight bishops should take it upon themselves to decide so peremptorily in regard to points of religion of so much weight, and which had hitherto remained undecided, declaring books to be canonical which had thus far been regarded as apocryphal, or at most uncertain, making a translation authentic which in numerous passages departs widely from the original text, and deciding in how limited or extended a sense men should understand the word of God. Moreover, among all these fathers there were none any way distinguished for learning; there were some good canon lawyers, but they had no extensive knowledge of religious matters; the few theologians there were below mediocrity; the assembly was principally made up of mere noblemen and courtiers; the greater part of the bishops had no actual sees, and those who were really bishops had such small dioceses, that all together they could not be considered as representing even the thousandth part of christendom. From all Germany there was not at this time a single bishop or theologian present in the council.

Others said that the points decided were after all of no such great importance as they appeared to be. As to traditions, the decree was a mere bag of wind; for to what purpose was it to ordain that the church should receive the traditions, and yet not decide which were the true traditions that must be received? Moreover, it was not even commanded that they should be received; it was only forbidden that they should knowingly and

consciously be despised; so that one might even reject them without violating the decree, provided he did it respectfully and reverently. The Papal court itself sets the example of such rejection; for it prohibits the ordination of deaconesses; it allows the people no vote in the choice of their pastors, when this was plainly an apostolic institution and observed in the church for more than eight hundred years; it obstinately withholds the cup from the laity, when Christ instituted the sacrament in both kinds, and it was so received by the apostles, and has been so observed by the whole church till within about two hundred years, and even now in all Christian churches except the Latin. If these be not traditions what else deserves the name? And in respect to the Vulgate, what signifies the affirmation of its authenticity, while the different editions vary so much from each other, and no one of these is pointed out as the correct one?

Such were the comments made at the time, and to this day they have lost none of their relevance or significance. The *only* authority for the reception of the apocryphal books into the Old Testament canon is the authority of the Council of Trent; and the entire worthlessness of that authority the preceding pages abundantly show.¹

III. THESE BOOKS NEVER HAD THE SANCTION OF CHRIST OR OF HIS APOSTLES, OR OF ANY OF THE WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The New Testament very frequently quotes, and much more frequently contains incidental allusions to, the Old. The Pentateuch, the prophetic books, the Psalms, and other parts of the sacred volume of the Hebrews, were continually on the minds of the writers, and flowed out in all their sayings and writings, as if welling up from the depths of their innermost religious consciousness. But in all these quotations and allusions, we look in vain for a reference to any of the apocryphal books. Though there are many places where incidents of the apocryphal writings would

¹ The statements in the above exhibition of the debates and decisions in the Council of Trent, rest on the following authorities: Sarpi's *Geschichte des Concil von Trident*, nebersetzt von Winterer. Band I. S. 290—298. The same translated by Brent, pp. 150—162. Mendham's *History of the Council of Trent*, pp. 48—68. Marheineke's *Christliche Symbolik*, II. S. 224—261. Perceval's *Roman Schism*, pp. 158—164.

afford illustrations exceedingly apt and beautiful, yet no such illustrations are ever found. If the writers of the New Testament were acquainted with any of these books (and it is scarcely possible to doubt that they had seen some of them), most carefully must they have abstained from alluding to them in their canonical writings.

They sanctioned the whole Hebrew canon as it existed in their time; but they sanctioned none of the apocryphal books, for they never quote them, and these books never formed a part of the Hebrew canon. We speak of the ancient apocryphal books which are printed in the Vulgate Bible, and not of the more recent ones, such as the Book of Enoch, the Ascension of Moses, etc. These, it is true, sometimes borrow from the New Testament (compare 2 Tim. 3: 8. Jude 9, 14); but the New Testament never from them, since it is itself more ancient than they are, or at least more ancient than the probably interpolated passages on which the stress is laid.

IV. THESE BOOKS FORMED NO PART OF THE ORIGINAL HEBREW CANON, AND WERE NOT WRITTEN TILL AFTER INSPIRATION HAD CEASED AND THE CANON WAS CLOSED.

On this point we have the most explicit, the entirely disinterested testimony of Josephus, the Jewish historian. In his work against Apion (I 8), he gives an account of all the books held sacred by the Hebrews, and this testimony is also copied by Eusebius, the celebrated Christian historian (Eccl. Hist. III. 10). This passage of Josephus we shall quote in full, as it stands in his writings, noting the variations that occur in Eusebius.

“ We have not innumerable books which contradict each other, but only twenty-two, which contain the history of all past times, and are justly believed to be divine. Five of these belong to Moses, and contain his laws, and the history of the origin of mankind, and reach to his death. This is a period of nearly three thousand years. From the death of Moses to Artaxerxes [Eusebius: to the death of Artaxerxes], who, after Xerxes, reigned over the Persians, the prophets who lived after Moses wrote down the events of their times in thirteen books. The other four books contain hymns to God and precepts for men. From Artaxerxes to our own times, our history has indeed been written; but these writings are not esteemed worthy of the same

credit as the former, because since that time we have no certain succession of prophets.

"What trust we put in these our writings is manifest by our deeds. Though so long time has elapsed, no one has ever dared to add to, or take from them, or make any change in them whatever. It is as it were inborn with every Jew, from the very first origin of the nation, to consider these books as the doctrines of God, to stand by them constantly, and, if need be, cheerfully to die for them. It is no new thing to see the captives of our nation, many of them in number and at many different times, endure tortures and deaths of all kinds in the public theatres, rather than utter a word against our laws, or the records which contain them."

Josephus here clearly recognizes the existence of the apocryphal books, and expressly excludes them from the canon; while he bears open testimony, as of a matter well-known to all the world, to the extreme and scrupulous care with which the Jews preserved all their canonical books free from mutilation and addition and change of every kind.

Comparing these explicit statements of Josephus with the numerous quotations from the Old Testament he has made in his historical writings, it is quite evident that the twenty-two books which he includes in the Hebrew canon, and which he affirms were held most sacred by the Jews who were contemporary with Christ and the apostles, are the following:

The five books of Moses:

- | | | |
|--------------|------------------|----------------|
| (1) Genesis. | (2) Exodus. | (3) Leviticus. |
| (4) Numbers. | (5) Deuteronomy. | |

The thirteen prophetic books:

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| (1) Joshua. | (2) Judges and Ruth. |
| (3) 2 Books of Samuel. | (4) 2 Books of Kings. |
| (5) 2 Books of Chronicles. | (6) Ezra and Nehemiah. |
| (7) Esther. | (8) Isaiah. |
| (9) Jeremiah. | (10) Ezekiel. |
| (11) Daniel. | (12) 12 Minor Prophets. |
| (13) Job. | |

The four books of hymns and precepts:

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------|
| (1) Psalms. | (2) Proverbs. |
| (3) Ecclesiastes. | (4) Canticles. |

This is according to the Jewish arrangement and nomenclature of the books, which in many respects differs from that which has been received into our English Bibles from the Greek translation of the Seventy.¹

V. THESE BOOKS WERE REJECTED WITH SINGULAR UNANIMITY
BY THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCHES AND THE BEST OF THE
CHURCH FATHERS.

(1) *Testimony of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, A. D. 170, who rejects them all.*

Melito was, after the apostles, one of the earliest bishops of the apocalyptic church of Sardis, a distinguished writer, and of great influence among the early Christians. He travelled to Palestine for the express purpose of ascertaining exactly the canon of the Old Testament, and gave the result of his investigations in the following letter to his friend Onesimus, which we find in Eusebius (Ecccl. Hist. B. IV. 26):

"Melito to Onesimus his brother, greeting: Since you have often, on account of your zeal for the word of God, begged of me to make selections for you, from the law and the prophets, concerning the Saviour and our whole faith; and as you, moreover, wished to learn accurately of the old books, how many they are in number and in what order they are written, I have earnestly endeavored to perform the same, well knowing your zeal for the faith and your great desire to learn the word of God; and that, through your earnest love toward God, you desire these more than all things else, striving for your eternal salvation.

"I accordingly went to the East, and, coming to the very place where these things were preached and transacted, I have accurately learned the books of the Old Testament. Their names are as follows: five books of Moses, to wit, Genesis; Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. Joshua Nave, Judges, Ruth. Four books of Kings [two of Samuel and two of Kings], two of Paralipomenon [Chronicles]. The Psalms of David, the Proverbs of Solomon (which is also Wisdom), Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Job. Of the prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah; and of the twelve prophets, one book; Daniel, Ezekiel, Esdras" [including also Nehemiah, and perhaps Esther].

¹ Compare Eichhorn's Einleit. in Alt. Test. B. I. S. 143—163.

Here this ancient bishop excludes every apocryphal book from the canon, though he must have known of their existence. From the names which he gives to some of the books, it is plain that he read them in the Septuagint translation; yet, though the apocryphal books had probably been added to this translation before his time, he carefully excludes them all. The most ancient church fathers were much more discriminating in their investigation of the sacred books, than the comparatively modern fathers in the Council of Trent. Melito knew whereof he affirmed, for he had examined with the greatest care, at the very source of information, and under the pressure of a very strong and elevated motive.

Melito does not give the name of the book of Esther, and in some other of the church fathers this name is also omitted. But this does not prove that the book of Esther was by them excluded from the canon. Many, supposing that book to have been written by Ezra, included it under the general name of Esdras. In Hebrew the books have no names, but each is designated by its initial words. Melito arranges the books in the order of time, and the four historical books preceding the captivity (two of Samuel and two of Kings) he calls by the general name of Kings, and so it is possible that he might have designated the three historical books subsequent to the captivity by the general name of Esdras, especially as Nehemiah was usually included in that designation, and Esther was by some supposed to be the work of Ezra.¹

It is possible, also, that Esther by these fathers might have been entirely excluded, on account of its being so encumbered with apocryphal additions, which they might have found it difficult to separate from the genuine work.

(2) *Testimony of Origen, the great Biblical Scholar of the Early Greek Church, A. D. 200, who rejects them all.*

The testimony of Origen is preserved by Eusebius (Eccl. Hist. VI. 25), and is for substance the following: "It should be observed that the collective books, as handed down by the Hebrews, are twenty-two, according to the number of letters in their alphabet. These twenty-two books, according to the Hebrews, are as

¹ Carey's Testimonies of the Fathers, p. 114. Eichhorn's Einleit. Alt. Test. I. 166.

follows: (1) Genesis; (2) Exodus; (3) Leviticus; (4) Numbers; (5) Deuteronomy; (6) Joshua, the son of Nave; (7) Judges and Ruth in one; (8) first and second of Kings in one (Samuel); (9) third and fourth of Kings in one; (10) first and second of Chronicles (Paralipomenon) in one; (11) Esdras, first and second (i. e. Nehemiah) in one; (12) Book of Psalms; (13) Proverbs of Solomon; (14) Ecclesiastes; (15) Song of Songs; (16) Isaiah; (17) Jeremiah, with Lamentations and the epistle, in one; (18) Daniel; (19) Ezekiel; (20) Job; (21) Esther."

It is remarkable that, though Origen twice says the Hebrew books are twenty-two, the list which he gives contains but twenty-one. On examination, we find the book of the twelve minor prophets omitted. This added, would make the requisite number of twenty-two. That there is here, not a mistake of Origen, but an error in the text of Eusebius, is manifest from the fact that the Latin translation of Origen by Rufinus has this book, as does also Hilary's prologue to the Psalms, which includes this passage of Origen.¹ Origen's other writings, also, show his acquaintance with these prophets.

It is, perhaps, not easy to determine what Origen intends by the *epistle of Jeremiah*. Possibly it may be the letter contained in the apocryphal book of Baruch, chapter vi. That Origen understood the difference between the canonical and apocryphal books is manifest from what he says in immediate connection with his catalogue: "Separate from these (ἐξω δὲ τούτων) are the Maccabees," etc.

(3) *Testimony of the Apostolic Canons, about A. D. 250, which probably reject them all.*

The text here is somewhat uncertain, and has evidently been tampered with. The copies vary from each other. One manuscript includes Judith, and some admit Maccabees; but the oldest and best copies exclude all the apocryphal books. The following is the catalogue according to the best testimony:

"Let these be the sacred and holy books for all, both clergy and laity, namely, of the Old Testament, of Moses five, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; of Joshua, the son

¹ Eichhorn's *Eiuleit.* in *Alt. Test.* I. 169, 170. Perceval's *Roman Schism*, p. 421.

of Nave, one; of Ruth one; of Kings four; of Paralipomenon [Chronicles], the book of days, two; of Esdras two [including Nehemiah]; of Esther one; of Job one; of the Psalter one; of Solomon three, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs; of the twelve prophets one; of Isaiah one; of Jeremiah one; of Ezekiel one; one of Daniel." There is then permission given to read the son of Sirach. The book of Judges is omitted, unless it be included under the name of Ruth. The text, however, is so imperfect, that we cannot very confidently rely upon it. Nevertheless, it shows, decidedly, that in the middle of the third century the apocryphal books had not yet found their way as canonical into the Christian church.¹

(4) *Testimony of Athanasius, the great Champion of Orthodoxy, A. D. 330, who rejects them all except Baruch.*

The testimony of this father may be found in his works, Tom. II. p. 39, Paris edition, 1629. It is as follows: "The books of the Old Testament are twenty-two, which is the number of the letters among the Hebrews. Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, of Kings four, two books; of Paralipomenon (Chronicles) two, one book; Esdras two, one book; Psalms, Proverbs; twelve prophets, one book; then Isaiah, Jeremiah with Baruch, Lamentations, and epistles; Ezekiel and Daniel. Then there are books uncanonical, but readable, the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit."

It is very curious that Athanasius should put Esther among the uncanonical books, and Baruch in the canonical; yet so it reads. Esther was encumbered with many apocryphal additions, and the epistle ascribed to Jeremiah in the book of Baruch was by some received as genuine. This may account for the mistake of Athanasius on this point; and the entire testimony of Athanasius clearly shows, that the apocryphal books, as a whole, were decidedly rejected by the church in his time.

There is another passage from Athanasius, very valuable on account of the clear distinction which it makes between the canonical and the apocryphal books. It is in the *Epist. Festal*, quoted by Carey (*Testimonies of the Fathers*, p. 117): "Since some persons have attempted to set in order the books that are called apocryphal, and to mix them with the divinely inspired

¹ Labbe and Cossart, Concil. I. 44. Perceval's Roman Schism, 421, 422.

Scriptures, of which we have been fully certified, as those who saw them from the beginning, and who, being ministers of the word, handed them down from our fathers, it seemed fitting to me, being exhorted thereto by the orthodox brethren, and having learned the truth, to set out in order the canonical Scriptures, which have been handed down, and are believed to be from God; that every one who has been deceived, may convict those who have led him astray." Here follows the list. He adds: "It is true that, besides these, there are other books which are not put into the canon, but yet are appointed by the fathers to be read by those who first come to be instructed in the way of piety." He then gives the names of most of the common apocryphal books.

(5) *Testimony of Hilary, the celebrated Bishop of Poitiers, A. D. 350, who rejects them all.*

Prologue to the Psalms, Sec. 15: "And this is the cause that the law of the Old Testament is arranged in twenty-two books, that they may correspond with the number of the Hebrew letters. According to the traditions of the ancients, they are so arranged that there are five books of Moses; Joshua Nave, six; Judges and Ruth, seven; first and second of Kings, eight; third and fourth of Kings, nine; of Paralipomenon two, ten; book of days of Esdras, eleven; Solomon's Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, thirteen, fourteen and fifteen; twelve prophets, sixteen; then Isaiah, Jeremiah with Lamentations and Epistle, these and Daniel and Ezekiel and Job and Esther, make up the number of twenty-two books. Some are pleased to add Tobit and Judith, to make the number twenty-four, according to the letters of the Greek alphabet."

This hint of Hilary's, which has already been referred to in another part of this discussion, is not an unfair specimen of a very considerable portion of the logic which we find among the good old fathers of the first four centuries. The Greeks had two more letters in their alphabet than the Hebrews had in theirs, and therefore it was well that they should have two more books in their Old Testament canon, to make all correspond; and it is suggested that for this purpose two can be taken out of the Apocrypha! No wonder that where such reasoning prevailed, spurious books sometimes crept in.

- (6) *Testimony of Epiphanius, the great Opposer of Heresy, A. D. 360, who rejects them all.*

"The Hebrews have two and twenty letters, and five of these have two forms; and also their sacred books are so disposed that they number twenty-two, and yet twenty-seven are found, because five of them are divided into two parts. Thus Ruth is joined to Judges, and both are reckoned as one book by the Hebrews; and the first of Paralipomenon is joined to the second, and both called one book; the first of Kings is joined to the second, and called one book; the third to the fourth, and so on. Thus the books are contained in four Pentateuchs, and two others remain besides; so that the canonical books are thus: five legislative, (1) Genesis, (2) Exodus, (3) Leviticus, (4) Numbers, (5) Deuteronomy; and this is the Pentateuch and the legislation. Then five are poetical, (6) the book of Job, (7) the Psalter, (8) Proverbs of Solomon, (9) Ecclesiastes, (10) Song of Songs. Then another Pentateuch which is called the writings, and by some the holy writings, which are as follows: (11) book of Joshua, son of Nave, (12) Judges with Ruth, (13) first of Paralipomenon with the second, (14) first of Kings with the second, (15) third of Kings with the fourth, (16) the twelve Prophets, (17) Isaiah, (18) Jeremiah, (19) Ezekiel, (20) Daniel; and this is the prophetic Pentateuch. Two others remain, which are, one of Esdras and this is also reckoned, and another book, which is called that of Esther. Thus the twenty-two books are completed, according to the number of the Hebrew letters." He then mentions two of the apocryphal books, to wit, the Wisdom of Solomon, and the book of Jesus Sirach, and says: "these indeed are useful books and profitable, but they are not placed in the number of the canonical." De Ponder. et Mens. II. 16.¹

- (7) *Testimony of the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 367, confirmed by the Fourth General Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, which rejects them all.*

The books of the Old Testament which must be read are: Genesis of the world, Exodus from Egypt, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua son of Nave, Judges, Ruth, Esther, of

¹ Perceval's Roman Schism, pp. 423, 424. Carey's Testimonies, pp. 116—118

Kings first and second, third and fourth, Paralipomenon first and second, Esdras first and second, book of 150 Psalms, Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, twelve Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah [and Baruch],¹ Lamentations and Epistles, Ezekiel, Daniel." Labbe and Cossart, Concil. I. 1509.

- (8) *Testimony of Gregory Nazianzen, the Fellow-student and distinguished Opponent of the Emperor Julian, A. D. 390, who rejects them all.*

Gregory gives a catalogue of the sacred books in one of those poetic effusions of his, which were quite famous in their day. We will content ourselves with simply giving the facts, without attempting to translate the poetry.

"All the historical books are twelve. The first is Genesis, then Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and the Second Law (Deuteronomy). Then Joshua, and Judges, and Ruth the eighth. The ninth and tenth books are the deeds of the Kings, then Paralipomenon, and you have Esdras the last. Five are the poetic books, of which the first is Job, then David, then three of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Song, and Proverbs. Five also are those of the prophetic spirit. Twelve [prophets] indeed are in one writing, Hosea, Amos, and Micah the third, then Jonah, Joel and Obadiah, Nahum, Habakuk and Zephaniah, Haggai, then Zachariah and Malachi. These make one book. The second is Isaiah, then Jeremiah, who was called from the womb, then Ezekiel, and the grace of Daniel. He gave two and twenty ancient books, corresponding to the letters of the Hebrew alphabet."

He then speaks of other books (*τούτων ἑκτός*) "separate from these," and (*οὐκ ἐν γρησίοις*) "not among the genuine;" thus showing that he was acquainted with the apocryphal books, and intelligently rejected them.

- (9) *Testimony of Amphilochius, the celebrated Bishop of Iconium, A. D. 190, who rejects them all.*

Amphilochius is the one who invented the argument, once so famous, which convinced the Emperor Theodosius of the deity of Christ. Going to the emperor to induce him to take some

¹ The book of Baruch is omitted in the best copies; see above, p. 282, debates in the Council of Trent.

measures against the Arians, he purposely omitted showing any respect to his son Arcadius. The emperor manifested indignation, and the bishop boldly said: "Sire, are you offended that an indignity is offered to your son? Then be assured God must abhor those who treat his Son with disrespect." The emperor, of course, after this, was very severe on the Arians.

The catalogue of Amphilochius is also in poetry, but it is not necessary for our purpose that we translate into verse.

"I will speak of the first books of the Old Testament. The Pentateuch, the Creation [Genesis], then Exodus; Leviticus is the middle book, after that, Numbers, then Deuteronomy. Add to these Joshua and Judges; then Ruth, four books of Kings, and two books of Paralipomenon; and upon these the first of Esdras, then the second. I will mention to you in order the five poetic books: Job, pressed with conflicts of various sufferings; the book of Psalms, the melodious cure for souls; three books of Solomon the wise, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs; and to these add the twelve prophets, Hosea first, then Amos the second, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, also Jonah, the type of his three days' passion, after these Nahum, Habakuk, then the ninth Zephaniah, Haggai and Zachariah, and the far-famed messenger Malachi. After which learn four prophets, Isaiah the great free-speaker, Jeremiah the sympathetic and mystic, Ezekiel, and Daniel the last, the same most wise in words and deeds. To these some also add Esther." *Lamb. ad Sel.*

This father, like some others, suggests a doubt as to Esther; but in all other respects his canon is precisely like ours, and excludes every one of the apocryphal books.

(10) *Testimony of Jerome, the great Biblical Scholar of the Latin Church, the Author of the very Vulgate itself, A. D. 400, who clearly and decidedly rejects them all.*

No one of the fathers had ever studied so thoroughly the literature of the Bible or understood it so well as Jerome. If Origen were his equal or even his superior, in general learning and iron industry, Jerome had most decidedly the advantage in sound judgment and common-sense principles of interpretation. Jerome divides and arranges the books of the Old Testament in the following manner: (1—5) five books of Moses; (6) Joshua; (7) Judges and Ruth; (8) two books of Samuel; (9) two books of

Kings; (10) Isaiah; (11) Jeremiah's Prophecy and Elegy; (12) Ezekiel; (13) twelve minor Prophets; (14) Job; (15) Psalms; (16) Proverbs; (17) Ecclesiastes; (18) Song of Solomon; (19) Daniel; (20) two books of Chronicles; (21) two books of Ezra, i. e. Ezra and Nehemiah; (22) Esther.

In his *Prologus galeatus* to the Vulgate, he makes the following statements, which are directly in the teeth of the decisions of the Council of Trent in respect to that very Vulgate. "There are twenty-two letters in the Hebrew alphabet . . . and five of these letters have two forms, to wit, Caph, Mem, Nun, Pe, Tsade. Hence with most, five of the books are divided into two, to wit, *Samuel*, *Melachim*, *Dibre Hajammim*, *Esdras*, and *Jeremiah* with *Cinoth*, that is, *Lamentations*.

"As there are, therefore, twenty-two elements, by which we write in Hebrew all that we speak . . . so there are reckoned twenty-two volumes. . . . The first book among them is called *Beresith*, which we name *Genesis*, the second *Veele Semoth*, the third *Vajicra*, that is, *Leviticus*, the fourth *Vajedabber*, which we call *Numbers*, the fifth *Elle Haddebarium*, which is styled *Deuteronomy*. These are the five books of Moses, which they appropriately style *Thora*, that is, the *Law*.

"They make a second rank of the *Prophets*, and they begin with *Jesus the son of Nave*, whom they call *Josue ben Nun*. Then they add *Sophetim*, that is, the book of *Judges*, in which they include *Ruth*, because her story belongs to the time of the judges. Third follows *Samuel*, which we call the first and second of *Kings*; the fourth *Melachim*, that is, *Kings*, which is contained in the third and fourth volume of *Kings*. . . . The fifth is *Esaias*, the sixth *Jeremias*, the seventh *Ezekiel*. The eighth is the book of the *twelve Prophets*, which among them is called *Thercasar*.

"The third rank contains the *Hagiographa*. The first book by *Job* begins; the second is by David, the volume of *Psalms* in five divisions. The third is Solomon, having three books, *Proverbs*, which they call *Misle*, that is, *Parables*, the fourth *Ecclesiastes*, that is, *Cohemoth*, the fifth *Song of Songs*, which they entitle *Sir Hassirim*. The sixth is *Daniel*, the seventh *Dibre Hajammim*, that is, the *Words of Days* . . . which among us is entitled the first and second of *Paralipomenon* (*Chronicles*). The eighth is *Esdras*, which the Greeks and Latins divide into two books [*Ezra* and *Nehemiah*], the ninth is *Esther*.

Thus there are twenty-two books of the *Old Law*, five of

Moses, eight of the *Prophets*, and nine of the *Hagiographa*. Some put *Ruth* and *Cinoth* in the *Hagiographa* . . . , and then the books of the Old Law are made twenty-four.

"This prologue of the Scriptures can serve as a fortified approach to all the books which we translate from the Hebrew into Latin; so that we may know that *whatever is beyond these must be put in the Apocrypha*. Therefore the book of *Wisdom*, which is commonly entitled the *Wisdom of Solomon*; the book of *Jesus the son of Sirach*, *Judith*, *Tobias*, and *Pastor*, ARE NOT IN THE CANON. I have found the *first of Maccabees* in Hebrew; the *second is Greek*, as can be proved from its very phraseology."

Preface to Jeremiah. "We omit the book of *Baruch* . . . which does not exist and is not read among the Hebrews."

Preface to Daniel. This book, "among the Hebrews has neither the story of *Susannah*, nor the hymn of the three youths, nor the fables of *Bel* and the *Dragon*."

Jerome also makes a similar remark in regard to the apocryphal additions to the book of *Esther*. In the very text of the Vulgate itself he notes with the most scrupulous care every apocryphal addition to the sacred text; and, had the Latin church but heeded the teachings of her great master on this subject, her Bible would never have been contaminated by its spurious excrescences; nor would the fathers of the Council of Trent have made a decision alike discreditable to their reputation as scholars and their sincerity and integrity as Christian men.

We will adduce but one other witness.

- (11) *Testimony of Ruffinus, the learned Translator of Origen, A. D. 400, who rejects them all.*

Ruffinus was a theological opponent of Jerome, and had many a sharp controversy with him in regard to Origen; but when he gives a catalogue of the sacred books, he agrees with Jerome exactly, and then proceeds to remark: "These are they which the Fathers concluded within the canon; of which they would have the assertions of our faith to consist. But we must know that there are other books, which are not called canonical, but ecclesiastical, by the ancients; such as the *Wisdom*, which is called of *Solomon*, and another *Wisdom*, which is called of the *Son of Sirach*; which book among the Latins is called by this general term '*Ecclesiasticus*,' by which word, not the author

of the book, but the quality of the writing is designated. Of the same order is the little book of Tobit, also Judith and the books of Maccabees."¹

From the preceding exhibition it is as plain as daylight can make anything plain, that the Romish church, in receiving the apocryphal books as a part of Scripture, has not only set at nought all historical truths, but acted in direct violation of its own fundamental principle. The *unanimous consent of the fathers* is what she requires for the establishment of a doctrine; but on this subject, instead of a *unanimous consent*, for the first four centuries she is met with an all but *unanimous dissent*. Her maxim is to receive only *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, is received; but here she obviously receives *quod nunquam, quod nullibi, quod ab nullo*, is received; and she anathematizes the Protestants and spurns their Bible as *mutilated* because they exclude from it those spurious writings which were excluded with most remarkable unanimity by the churches and fathers of the first four centuries, including their own most boasted saints and their own most celebrated churches, the saints of Rome and the very church of Rome itself among the rest. The only shadow of a discrepancy from the strict Protestant view of the Old Testament canon, which we find in any of them, is, that, in one or two instances, the book of Baruch seems to be included and the book of Esther excluded. Yet even these instances, as we have already seen, are far from being certain; as to the great mass of the apocryphal books, the testimony against them for the first four centuries is unequivocal, unimpeachable, and perfectly decisive. The decree of the Council of Trent on this subject was neither more nor less than a most wretched blunder, arising partly from ignorance and partly from partisan heat and blindness. A church which claims infallibility, can never correct her own blunders, but must hold on upon them till they eat the very heart out of her, as a man may be destroyed, mind and body, by the morbid growth of an ineradicable wen.

The fourth point proposed, to wit, the examination of the apocryphal books themselves, will afford ample material for a separate discussion.

¹ Perceval's Roman Schism, p. 426. Carey's Testimonies of the Fathers, p. 119.

ARTICLE IV.

THE RELATION OF DAVID'S FAMILY TO THE MESSIAH.

By E. P. Barrows, Jr., Professor at Andover.

FOR the clear understanding of a large part of the Messianic prophecies, it is necessary that we rightly apprehend the relation of David's family to the Messiah.

And, first of all, we must remember that this relation had for its basis a pure act of Divine sovereignty. The sovereignty of God does, indeed, underlie the whole constitution of the church from the beginning. Abraham was not constituted the father of the faithful by his own act, but by the act of God. The covenant came not from him but from God, in the form of a free sovereign promise: "I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."¹ By the same sovereignty Isaac was made the heir of the promise given to Abraham, and Ishmael was rejected. And, lest any one should say that the ground of this preference lay in the fact that Isaac was the son of the free woman, and Ishmael of the bond woman, he afterwards chose Jacob, and rejected Esau, his twin-brother, before the children had been born, or done either good or evil, "that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth."² The same sovereignty was afterwards displayed in the selection of Moses to lead the Israelites out of Egypt, of Joshua to be their military chieftain in the conquest of Canaan, and of the Judges who successively delivered them from the oppression of the surrounding nations; but, especially, in the appointment of the tribe of Levi to the general ministry of religion, and the family of Aaron in that tribe to the priesthood.

And when, in compliance with the request of the Israelites, a king was to be set over them, God did not leave to them the selection; he exercised his sovereign prerogative in a twofold way.

By his own immediate act he designated Saul as the man whom he had chosen; and, when he had now been solemnly

¹ Gen. 12: 3.

² Rom. 9: 11.

installed in the kingly office, he placed him on probation, not for himself personally, but for his family. After Saul's first offence in the matter of the burnt-offering, Samuel said to him: "Thou hast done foolishly: thou hast not kept the commandment of the Lord thy God, which he commanded thee: for now would he have established thy kingdom upon Israel forever. But now thy kingdom shall not continue: the Lord hath sought him a man after his own heart, and the Lord hath commanded him to be captain over his people, because thou hast not kept that which the Lord commanded thee."¹ The very prerogative which was afterwards conferred upon David's royal line: "Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee: thy throne shall be established forever,"² is here named as one that would have been given to Saul and his house, had he continued to obey God. The language of Samuel addressed to Saul after his second offence in the matter of the Amalekites: "Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king;"³ "The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbor of thine that is better than thou,"⁴ must be interpreted in harmony with the subsequent dealings of God with Saul and David. It was not the purpose of God to depose Saul personally from the kingly office and put David in his stead. This David understood perfectly. He always spoke of Saul as "the Lord's anointed," and twice rejected with abhorrence the proposal to take his life, when the providence of God had placed it in his power, saying: "Who can stretch forth his hand against the Lord's anointed and be guiltless?"⁵ It does not appear that Saul's jealousy of David respected himself personally. It was in behalf of his children that he feared the son of Jesse. "As long as the son of Jesse liveth upon the ground," said he to Jonathan, "thou shalt not be established, nor thy kingdom. Wherefore now send and fetch him unto me, for he shall surely die."⁶ The oath which he exacted of David in the wilderness of En-gedi, in immediate view of the fact that David had spared his own life, was that he would not cut off his posterity. "And now, behold I know well that thou shalt surely be king, and that the kingdom of Israel shall be established in thine hand. Swear now unto me by the Lord, that thou wilt not cut off my seed after me, and that thou

¹ 1 Sam. 13: 13, 14.² 2 Sam. 7: 16.³ 1 Sam. 15: 23.⁴ 1 Sam. 15: 28.⁵ 1 Sam. 26: 9.⁶ 1 Sam. 20: 31.

wilt not destroy my name out of my father's house."¹ The words of Samuel, then: "The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbor of thine that is better than thou," have respect to Saul and David as the heads of two families. The Lord had, that very day, in his declared purpose, taken the kingdom from the house of Saul, and transferred it to the house of David.

And when another king was to be selected in place of Saul's house, we see another twofold exercise of God's prerogative. He did not leave the choice to the people of Israel, nor to his prophet, but retained it in his own power; and the whole matter was conducted in such a way as to manifest in a remarkable manner his sovereignty. The elder sons of Jesse were rejected one by one, and the youngest, who had been left in charge of the sheep, was chosen.

Passing now to the time when David, after the overthrow of Saul's house, had been invested with the sovereignty over all Israel, we find him also placed upon probation with reference to his posterity. It was not till he had fought the battles of the Lord through a long period of years, and his obedience had been subjected to a thorough trial, that he received the memorable promise recorded in the seventh chapter of the second book of Samuel. By this promise the kingdom was confirmed to his seed forever. "The Lord telleth thee that he will make thee an house. And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son."² It is manifest that this promise respects not Solomon in his simple personality, but Solomon in his house. It insures the kingdom to Solomon's family forever. One of the ideas included in the words: "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son,"³ is that of *heirship*, and the good indefeasible title connected with this. It is not Solomon alone, in his individual character, whom God takes into the relation of sonship, but Solomon's royal line, including, in a special and incommunicable sense (as will be hereafter shown), the Messiah, to whom this line extends, and in whom it is perpetuated forever.

¹ 1 Sam. 24: 20, 21.

² Vs. 11—14.

³ אֲנִי אֲהִיָּהּ לָּהּ וְהִיא קָהָה לִּי לְבֵן.

But there was yet in David's mind a ground of solicitude which the Divine promise anticipates. For the transgression of Saul his family had been rejected. Might not the same thing happen to David's house through the iniquity of his descendants? This question is met in the words which follow: "If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men: but my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee. And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee: thy throne shall be established forever."¹ The precise import of these words will be presently considered at large. It is sufficient here to say that they contain the explicit assurance that the prerogative of occupying the throne of Israel, however its actual exercise may be limited through the iniquity of David's children, shall never be *transferred* to another family.

We have seen that the relation of David's family to the Messiah had for its basis an immediate act of Divine sovereignty. It remains to inquire concerning the interior nature of this relation. But, before we proceed directly to this work, it seems necessary to consider a difficulty which has probably forced itself upon the mind of every thoughtful student of the Old Testament. The difficulty is this: Admitting that Jesus of Nazareth was, in some true sense, the successor of David on the throne of Israel (according to the declaration of the angel Gabriel: "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David"²), how can we reconcile with the promise of God to David: "Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee: thy throne shall be established forever," the historic fact that, for several centuries preceding the advent of Christ, David's posterity were excluded from the exercise of the royal prerogative? The promise seems to imply a continuous succession of kings from David's family on the throne of Israel. By the prophet Jeremiah it is stated with still greater strength: "Thus saith the Lord; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel;"³ and it is made more explicit, also, by being immediately connected with a similar promise to the house of Levi: "Neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle meat-offerings, and to do sacrifice continually."⁴ That this difficulty was deeply felt by the ancient servants of God during the decline of

¹ Vs. 14—16.² Luke 1: 32.³ Jer. 33: 17.⁴ Jer. 33: 18.

the theocracy, is manifest from the eighty-ninth Psalm, which cannot, with any probability, be ascribed to an earlier period than that immediately preceding the exile. After a highly wrought poetic expansion of the original promise to David, the writer proceeds to draw the sad contrast between this, and the existing condition of David's house. "But thou hast cast off and abhorred, thou hast been wroth with thine anointed. Thou hast made void the covenant of thy servant: thou hast profaned his crown by casting it to the ground," etc.¹

The general principle of solution for this difficulty has already been indicated. Although God, for the iniquity of David's children, *withdrew* from them *the exercise* of the royal prerogative, he never *transferred* it to another family, but *reserved* it for the promised Messiah, who was to be of the house and lineage of David. With the original promise God had connected a threatening: "If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men."² The nature and extent of the chastisement were left undefined. It might be carried to any degree of severity not inconsistent with the limiting clause: "But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee."³ It is not necessary to assume that either David himself, to whom the promise was made, or the succeeding prophets before the captivity who referred to it, understood the exact limitation of the annexed threatening. That was one of the "secret things" reserved for a future providential development. It was, however, entirely reasonable to suppose that the chastisement of a line of kings might involve their actual exclusion from the throne for an indefinite period of time, and the subjection of their kingdom to the yoke of a foreign conqueror. When Manasseh was bound in fetters and carried to Babylon,⁴ no one would think of calling this a violation of the Divine promise to David. All would see that it was but the fulfilment of the annexed threatening. But if an individual successor of David might be deprived of the exercise of kingly power, why not the line of succession, for such a period as God should determine, provided only that the throne was made sure, in the final issue, to David's house? In this wide and general sense is the promise interpreted in the hundred and thirty-second Psalm. "The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David; he will not turn from it; of the fruit of thy

¹ Vs. 38—45. ² 2 Sam. 7: 14. ³ 2 Sam. 7: 15. ⁴ 2 Chron. 33: 11.

body will I set upon thy throne. If thy children will keep my covenant and my testimony that I shall teach them; their children also shall sit upon the throne forevermore."¹ In the promise which is several times repeated in the Old Testament: "that David my servant may have a light always before me in Jerusalem,"² the main idea is, that God will not finally alienate from the house of David the throne of Israel by giving it to another family. This is manifest from the connection in which the words originally occur: "Howbeit I will not take the whole kingdom out of his [Solomon's] hand: but I will make him prince all the days of his life for David my servant's sake, whom I chose, because he kept my commandments and my statutes: but I will take the kingdom out of his son's hand, and will give it unto thee [Jeroboam], even ten tribes. And unto his son will I give one tribe, that David my servant may have a light (Heb. *נֵר*, *lamp*. i. e. *offspring*, to make his house visible, as it were, and keep it in view) alway before me in Jerusalem, the city which I have chosen to put my name there."³

And if we turn to the passage of Jeremiah already referred to, we shall find that the prophet's language, strong as it is, assumes, nevertheless, the *suspension* of the kingly power in David's family, and the captivity of the nation as events just at hand. It was uttered near the close of Zedekiah's reign, while the king of Babylon's army was besieging Jerusalem, and the prophet himself was shut up in the court of the prison which was in the king's house.⁴ Jeremiah had prophesied that the Chaldeans should prevail against Judah, and carry both king and people into captivity; and he had himself several years before fixed the period of this captivity at seventy years.⁵ We cannot, in the face of this explicit prophecy, interpret the language of Jeremiah to mean that there shall be an uninterrupted succession of kings of David's line exercising royal power in Jerusalem. An examination of the context shows that he has reference to the preservation of David's family during the coming calamities, and its future restoration to the kingly office *in the person of the Messiah*. He first predicts the restoration of Judah and Israel to their own land after their captivity,⁶ and then adds: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good

¹ Vs. 11, 12.² 1 Kings 11: 36. 15: 4. 2 Kings 8: 19. Ps. 132: 17.³ 1 Kings 11: 34—36.⁴ Jer. 32: 1, 2, compared with 33: 1.⁵ Jer. 25: 11, 12.⁶ Jer 33: 6—13.

thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness."¹ The "Branch of righteousness" which is to grow up unto David is undeniably the Messiah.² It is under his reign that "Judah shall be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely." Then follow immediately the words already quoted: "For thus saith the Lord; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel,"³ which is twice repeated with a solemn asseveration: "Thus saith the Lord; If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers."⁴

It is not to be supposed that the prophet saw this glorious era in its chronological connections. It was the Messiah's day itself which he saw, and not its location in time. Here the remarks of Barnes on the character and nature of prophecy are altogether in place: "From this view it also follows that the prophecies are usually to be regarded as seen *in space* and not *in time*; or, in other words, the time would not be accurately and definitely marked. They would describe the *order*, or the succession of events; but between them there might be a considerable, and an unmeasured interval of time. In illustration of this we may refer to the idea which has been so often presented already—the idea of a landscape. When one is placed in an advantageous position to view a landscape, he can mark distinctly the *order* of the objects, the succession, the *grouping*. He can tell what objects appear to him to lie *near* each other; or what are apparently in juxtaposition. But all who look at such a landscape know very well that there are objects which the eye can-

¹ Jer. 33: 14—16.

² Compare Isa. 11: 1. Jer. 23: 5. Zech. 3: 8. The Messiah is a *branch* or *scion* from the stem or stump of David's house, which is here compared to an ancient tree which has gone to decay, and of which only the root is left alive under ground. The very term contains an exact and striking prophecy of the condition of David's royal line at the advent of Christ.

³ Jer. 33: 17.

⁴ Jer. 38: 20, 21, 25, 26.

not take in, and which will not be exhibited by any description. For example, hills in the distant view may seem to be *near* each other; one may seem to rise just back of the other, and they may appear to constitute parts of the same mountain range, and yet *between* them there may be wide and fertile vales, the *extent* of which the eye cannot measure, and which the mind may be wholly unable to conjecture. It has no means of measuring the distance, and a description of the whole scene as it *appeared* to the observer would convey no idea of the distance of the intervals. So in the prophecies. Between the events-seen in vision there may be long intervals, and the length of those intervals the prophet may have left us no means of determining."¹ The chronological position of such prophecies must, as he afterwards remarks, "be determined either by the actual *admeasurement* as the events occur; or by direct revelation either made to the prophet himself, or to some other prophet." This view of the nature of prophecy derives strong confirmation from a consideration of the *uses* which it subserves in the economy of redemption. These are plainly, not to gratify our curiosity by enabling us to arrange beforehand the events of history in their exact chronological order and extent; but, *first*, before its fulfilment, to sustain and animate God's people in the dark periods of their history by holding out to them the promise of a bright future; *secondly*, after its fulfilment, to strengthen their faith in God's word as a true Divine revelation, and in all its remaining unfulfilled promises.

The sum of the argument, then, under this head, is, that the covenant with David, now under consideration, conferred upon his family an indefeasible title to the throne of Israel for all coming ages, while the annexed threatening left God at liberty to chastise both the nation and its reigning family in any way and to any extent not involving the final rejection of David's house.

We now proceed to consider directly the interior nature of the relation between David's family and the Messiah. The prophecies of the Old Testament declare, as we have seen, that David's throne shall be established forever; the writers of the New Testament affirm that these prophecies are fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth: "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for-

¹ Introduction to Commentary on Isaiah, § 7, III. 5.

ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."¹ He himself claimed to be the promised king of David's line, when he publicly entered Jerusalem riding upon an ass, allowed the multitudes to spread their garments before him in the way, in recognition of his kingly dignity, and approved of the shouts of the children in the temple, when they said: "Hosanna to the Son of David."² In what sense, then, is he the successor of David and his sons upon the throne of Israel?

Here it is necessary, first of all, that we apprehend correctly the nature of both David's kingdom and the "kingdom of heaven" established by Christ. If the views entertained by many concerning the former kingdom, are low and unworthy, there are afloat in the religious world ideas respecting the latter which are more ethereal and romantic than scriptural. The combined effect of these errors is to hide from view the essential unity of these two kingdoms upon which the word of God so strongly insists. What we have to say on this subject will be included in the following propositions:

I. *The primary element of David's kingdom was the visible church of God.* That from the call of Abraham to the advent of Christ, God had a visible church in the world, will hardly be denied by any one. If this did not shine forth from every page of inspiration with such clearness as to need no demonstration, it could be abundantly established from the words of the Apostle Paul: "And this I say, That the covenant which was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore, then, serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made."³ "It was *added*" to the Abrahamic covenant for a special purpose — "because of transgressions;" and for a limited period — "till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." It does not then *annul* this covenant and take its place. Rather did the Abrahamic covenant interpenetrate the Mosaic as a life-giving principle. It was its redemptive, and therefore its main, element. Without the principle of faith contained in

¹ Luke 1: 32, 33.

² Matt. 21: 7—16; and the parallel passages in the other Gospels.

³ Gal. 3: 17—19.

the Abrahamic covenant, the Mosaic economy would have been, from the beginning, just what the Jews of our Saviour's day made it by eliminating from it this principle—a dead mass of meats, and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances;”¹ “weak and beggarly elements;”² a “letter” that “killeth,” and not a “spirit” that “giveth life.”³ The promise made to Abraham, and conditioned upon faith alone, was, so to speak, the soul of the Israelitish theocracy, while the Mosaic economy was only the body wherewith God was pleased for a limited period to clothe it. The church was embodied in the State, not annihilated by it. And it was embodied, not as an incidental and subordinate element, but as the great central principle, to which everything else was made subservient. The State existed for the church, not the church for the State. It was because the kingdom of David embodied in itself the divinely appointed institutions of religion—that is to say, the church of God as a visible organization—that God conferred upon it such preëminence above all other kingdoms, and gave to it such “exceeding great and precious promises.” These promises were not made to the Israelites in a merely political capacity, as one of the nations of the earth which God chose to regard with especial favor, but to the Israelites as the true visible church of God.

But David was, as we have seen, the divinely appointed head of Israel. He was, therefore, the earthly head of God's visible church. The wars in which he was engaged with the surrounding nations, who sought to destroy Israel, were wars for the preservation and enlargement of God's earthly kingdom. His victories were victories in behalf of the truth; for, under that economy, the cause of the truth was identified with the cause of the Israelites, the divinely constituted depositaries of God's truth. Here it is necessary that we guard against a narrow and exclusive view of the instrumentalities employed by God in different ages for the perpetuation and enlargement of his cause in the world. These instrumentalities must always be in harmony with the outward form of his kingdom, and must vary as that form varies. By the Mosaic institutions God was pleased to give to his church a national and political, not, as afterwards, an ecumenical and purely spiritual form. Under such a national form, conflicts, sword in hand, with the surrounding nations were altogether in place; and in the direction and issue of these con-

¹ Heb. 9: 10.² Gal. 4: 9.³ 2 Cor. 3: 6.

flicts God displayed in a glorious manner his supremacy and infinite perfections, for the furtherance of the cause of truth and the instruction of all coming ages.

Let this truth, then, be remembered, that the primary element of David's kingdom was the visible church of God; and that David, being by Divine appointment the earthly head of Israel, was also the earthly head of the church embosomed in Israel.

II. *Christ is, in a true and proper sense, the head and king of the visible church.* It is not probable that any of our readers will deny this proposition; but there is danger that some may etherealize its meaning till it becomes a very tenuous and unsubstantial idea. To avoid error here, it is necessary that we carefully distinguish between the *invisible* reign of Christ in the hearts of his true disciples, and his *visible* kingdom in the world. His invisible kingdom (which is, of necessity, above the sphere of human organizations, and administered by him alone) consists of all who have a vital union with him by faith; his visible kingdom is the entire body of those who are associated together as his professed disciples. That the visible kingdom of Christ has for its main end the advancement of the inward work of grace in men's hearts, is a truth which shines by its own light. Still, it must not be confounded with this work. It is an earthly organization established by God's direction; carried on in its outward form by human instrumentalities; and, as such, liable to errors, abuses and false membership. "One of the most common appellations," says Dr. John M. Mason, "by which she [the church] is there [in the New Testament] distinguished, is, 'the kingdom of heaven.' This can be but one; or else it would not be a kingdom, and *the* kingdom, but several. And this one must be visible, because its ordinances are administered by visible agency.¹ Nay, it is only *as visible*, that it admits of the exercise of any part of its government by men. The church invisible, which eludes every human sense and faculty, cannot be the object of human functions. And, to preclude mistake in this matter, our Lord informs us that his kingdom, while in the world, shall, like other kingdoms, have false as well as true subjects. That hypocrites shall so intermingle with saints as to render their separation in the present life impossible by any means which will not exterminate both. Such is the manifest import of the parable of the 'tares,' Matt. 13: 24—30."² And again:

¹ Matt. 16: 19. 28: 19, 20. John 20: 21—23.

² Essays on the Church. No. 1.

"The Scriptures, the Sabbath, the solemn assembly, the sacraments, the ministry; in a word, the whole system of instituted worship, is visible. Now, is it not a most incredible thing, that the church and the ordinances committed to her, should be of opposite natures? Or rather, that the ordinances should have a solid, external existence, and the church to which they are given, no such existence at all! A visible Bible, visible ministry, visible worship, visible sacraments, visible discipline, and no visible church! Nothing but a phantom, a metaphysical idea, as the repository of God's truth and institutions!"¹ And once more, commenting on the words of the Apostle Paul: "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular," he says: "The question is, what are we to understand by 'the body of Christ?' That it signifies a *whole*, is as plain as that words signify anything. Then, *what whole*? Not the church at Corinth, far less a particular congregation, unless the commission of the apostles, and the use of spiritual gifts, extend no further. Not the church of the elect; for there are no 'schisms' in that body, *as such*. A schism which cannot be perceived is no schism; and the moment you render it perceptible, you are in the visible church." . . . "It can be no other than what we have called the *Visible Church Catholic*."²

Over this "Visible Church Catholic" the Lord Jesus reigns in a true and proper sense. That he exercised the prerogatives of her king while he remained on earth is certain. All the ordinances peculiar to the New Testament economy are of his direct appointment. He selected the primitive preachers of the Gospel and endowed them with miraculous powers. Was it then by his ascent to heaven from the Mount of Olives that he vacated the throne? The Scriptural account of his ascension is the very reverse of this. "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God."³ In what character did he sit down on the right hand of God, except that of supreme Head of his church, and that he might administer the government of the world for her good? "Who is gone," says the Apostle Peter, "into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto him."⁴ And again: "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same

¹ Essays on the Church. No. 1.² Mark 16: 19.³ Ibid.⁴ 1 Pet. 3: 22.

Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.”¹ Jesus himself, immediately before his ascension, asserted his kingly power over his visible church, and its perpetuation to the end of the world, in the strongest and most explicit language. “And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.”² The original words here rendered, “teach all nations,” mean literally, “make disciples of all nations;”³ and this we know, from the apostolic mode of procedure, included the idea of gathering all nations, so far as they could be brought to receive the Gospel, into the visible church. It was, then, in the work of establishing over all the earth his visible church, through which, as an instrumentality, he carries forward his invisible work of grace in men's hearts, that Christ enjoined upon the apostles (and, by necessary implication, upon all his ministers “even unto the end of the world”) that they should teach men to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them, and promised his presence with them to the end of time.

We must not suffer our Lord's personal absence from his visible church to obscure the great and glorious truth that he remains, in a true and proper sense, her Head and King. If earthly monarchs, in furthering the interests of their kingdoms, can be personally absent from their dominions for indefinite periods of time, without vacating the throne, much more can the King of kings. He sits on the right hand of God, because that is the most suitable position from which to administer “the kingdom of heaven” with which the Father has solemnly invested him. In the ascension gift of the Holy Spirit, he has made good to the churches the loss of his personal presence. “I will,” said he in reference to his departure, “pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever.”⁴ And again: “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth.”⁵ In this glorious vicegerent his people have all that they need. They want no

¹ Acts 2: 36.² Matt. 28: 18—20.³ μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.⁴ John 14: 16.⁵ John 16: 12, 13.

earthly head to be lord over their faith, and he has appointed no such head. It was the Comforter whom he promised to guide them into all the truth, not some "sovereign pontiff," to thrust upon them his pretended infallible decisions.

III. *The church of the Old Testament is identical with that of the New.* Here we might adduce the unanswerable argument of the author whose words have been already quoted, that there are numerous promises made to the *Jewish* church, in her public capacity, which can be fulfilled only to the *Christian* church, such as the following: "The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising — the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee; the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee."¹ But we prefer to exhibit the direct proof from the words of inspiration.

The Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, introduces an extended argument to show that the Abrahamic covenant was not annulled by the introduction of the Mosaic Law; but is, on the contrary, the covenant under which all believers are now the seed of Abraham, and heirs to the promise: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," which promise is fulfilled in Christ.

First; the Mosaic law did not annul the covenant made with Abraham. "And this I say, that the covenant which was confirmed before of God in Christ," — Christ being the substance of the blessings which it promised — "the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect."² The promise made to Abraham, then, was standing in the Apostle's day, and it is standing now.

Secondly; the covenant made with Abraham is that under which all believers are now the seed of Abraham, and heirs to the promise: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." "Know ye therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham."³

Thirdly; the promise made to Abraham is fulfilled in Christ. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made

¹ Isa. 60: 3, 5; quoted in Essay 1.

² Gal. 3: 17.

³ Gal. 3: 7—9.

a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith."¹ And again: "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."²

This reasoning is absolutely conclusive for the unity of the church in all ages. It was in and through the covenant made with Abraham that God established his visible church in the world. The covenant remaining unchanged, the church, of which the covenant is the soul and centre, remains unchanged also. The outward rite of circumcision was not essential to the covenant. That was added several years afterwards, as something suitable, indeed, but not essential. Much less was the livery of the Mosaic law essential, which was superadded, after the lapse of more than four hundred years. Of these additions, the former, the rite of circumcision, might be changed, and the latter, the Mosaic law, abrogated, without affecting the covenant itself; for, beyond contradiction, what has been added to a covenant already valid, may be changed or taken away at the pleasure of the original authority, without injury to its validity.

But the same Apostle introduces another chain of argumentation, the entire force of which rests upon the assumption of the unity of the church under the Old and New Testaments. He compares the Jewish church to an olive-tree, from which the unbelieving Jews are broken off, and into which the believing Gentiles are grafted. "And if some of the branches," he says, "be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive-tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree; boast not thyself against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee."³ "Thou," the Gentile, "bearest not the root, but the root thee." Then the good old olive-tree which God planted in Abraham's day, was not dug up by the roots at Christ's advent, that it might give place to a new olive-tree, but the believing Gentiles were grafted into it; and thus was fulfilled the original promise to Abraham: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." From Abraham to the trump of the archangel there is one olive-tree, of which Christ is the root, and all believers are its branches.

¹ Gal. 3: 13, 14.² Gal. 3: 29.³ Rom. 11: 17, 18.

IV. *Christ is, in a true and proper sense, the successor of David on the throne of Israel.* If we abide by the words of the angel Gabriel: "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David," the question is settled without further discussion. But we have seen that the kingdom of which David was the earthly head, is for substance the same as that over which Christ reigns at the right hand of God. Had God's church been only an incidental and subordinate appendage to David's kingdom, then, indeed, would the case have been different. But we have seen that the visible church was its primary element. It was, therefore, the element from which it took its character as a peculiar kingdom; the element in and through which alone could be fulfilled the promise: "Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee: thy throne shall be established forever."

It is no valid objection to this view that Christ is the head of the visible church in a higher sense than was David. Christ is David's "*root*" and "*Lord*," by whom "were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible." He is "before all things, and by him all things consist; and he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the preëminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell."¹ As such he is "the head over all things to the church, which is his body,"² in a high and incommunicable sense. But this is not inconsistent with Christ's being also, as the same Scriptures teach, the "*offspring*" and "*son*" of David, and, as such, his successor, in a true and proper sense, on the throne of Israel. As the lower sense does not exclude the higher, so neither does the higher, the lower. There is a common idea belonging to the office of both David and Christ. Each was, by Divine appointment, constituted the head of his visible church, the former with limited powers and prerogatives, such as are competent to a mere man; the latter with a plenary investiture of "all power in heaven and in earth," for which his Divine nature qualified him.

Nor is it any valid objection to this view that Christ administers his kingdom under another outward form. Let us look at the nature and extent of this change.

The initiatory rite of admission to the church was, under

¹ Col. 1: 15—19.

² Eph. 1: 22, 23.

David, circumcision; under Christ, it is baptism. But circumcision was not an essential part of the original covenant with Abraham, for it was added to the covenant several years after its original establishment. It is manifest that what could be added to the covenant could also be taken away or changed, without affecting its validity. We hold, as a truth admitting of clear demonstration, that the rite of baptism has, by Divine appointment, taken the place of circumcision.

Again; Christ has set aside the whole Mosaic ritual, and what was closely interwoven with this, the national character of the church, to make room for an ecumenical and more spiritual form. But the Mosaic ritual was, as we have seen, superadded at a later date for special and temporary ends, "till the seed should come to whom the promise was made."¹ Jesus Christ, the promised seed, having come, its abolition followed as a matter of course. And with regard to the ecumenical form which Christ has given to his church—"Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature,"—that was one of the original provisions of the Abrahamic covenant. "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed,"—this is the original broad foundation of God's church. Did "the kingdom of heaven," as administered by Christ, embrace anything less than the whole world, it would not rest on the primitive platform.

Finally; Christ administers his government from a heavenly, and not from an earthly, throne. But this change naturally connects itself, as we have seen, with his Divine nature. He is not only the son of David, but also, in a high and incommunicable sense, the Son of God; and, as such, it is suitable that his throne should be in heaven at the right hand of his Father.

The changes that have been enumerated respect only the outward form of "the kingdom of heaven," not its inward substance. Its great foundation principles remain the same through all generations, and in them lies its unity under the Old and New Testament. Jesus Christ has, in a true and proper sense, received "the throne of his father David," for he has received that "kingdom of heaven" of which David was, by Divine appointment, the visible earthly head.

We are now in a right position to understand and interpret that large section of the Messianic prophecies which is based on

¹ Gal. 3: 19.

the original covenant with David's family that has been under consideration. This includes, among other Psalms, the second and seventy-second; the eleventh chapter of Isaiah; the thirtieth chapter of Jeremiah with the two following; the thirty-fourth, thirty-sixth, and thirty-seventh chapters of Ezekiel; and many other passages scattered throughout both the larger and the smaller prophets, which it is not necessary here to enumerate. The fundamental idea in all these prophecies is the perpetuity of David's kingdom, and its final ascendancy over all the earth. The principal point of difference, when we compare them among themselves, is that some of them, as the two Psalms above named, take no notice of the intervening depression of David's family, while in others this is a very prominent feature of the portraiture. This is to be explained from the different positions which these passages hold in the chain of Messianic prophecy. The second Psalm, for example, was written while the theocracy was in the zenith of its glory, assaulted by powerful foes, yet always prevailing against them. That the spirit of prophecy should here have brought to view the future depression of David's kingdom, would have been altogether unnatural and out of place. He exhibits only its Divinely sustained and imperishable vigor. It is a kingdom that must triumph over all assaults, because God has established it, and given to its Divinely constituted head, the family of David, the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession.

But there are other Messianic prophecies of the class now under consideration, such as the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, which were written during the wane of the Jewish power; and these contain, as is natural, intimations of a further depression; a hewing down, so to speak, of David's royal tree, out of whose root shall arise, at a future day, the promised Messiah.

Others, again, were written at the beginning of the Babylonish captivity, or under the full pressure of its calamities, when the children of David, to whom God had confirmed the kingdom forever, had been violently thrust from the throne of their ancestors, with no prospect of speedy restoration. Such prophecies always abound with promises of a *future restoration of David's throne in the person of the Messiah.*

If, now, we leave out of view the primary element of David's kingdom, and that which alone gave to it the high prerogative of perpetuity and universal dominion, the visible church of

God embosomed in it, we shall be under the necessity of adopting, in the interpretation of prophecies of this class, one of the two following methods.

First, we may say that some parts of them refer wholly to Christ, and others wholly to David and his family, all real connection between David's kingdom and that of Christ being excluded. If we attempt to carry this principle through the entire web of these Messianic prophecies, assigning some parts to Christ alone, and others to David alone (since it is clearer than daylight that all which they contain cannot be applied to Christ himself), we shall soon find ourselves involved in a labyrinth of difficulties from which no Ariadne's thread of legitimate exegesis can extricate us. Our only expedient will be to break through its walls by main force in defiance of all laws of interpretation.

Secondly, we may say that they refer to David and his kingdom *only as typical* of Christ, the real reference being to Christ alone. But if David's kingdom did not include in itself the visible church of God as its main element, the element from which it received its distinctive character, then it has perished utterly and forever. The Messiah's kingdom is not the restoration and enlargement of David's kingdom so often promised in these prophecies; but it is wholly another kingdom. If we attempt to carry this principle through the Messianic prophecies which are based on the original covenant with David and his family, we shall find ourselves again at war with their plainest declarations concerning the relation of David's kingdom to that of the Messiah. The promise is not: "Thine house and thy kingdom shall be a *type* of a kingdom that shall be established forever;" but: "Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever."

But as soon as we admit the essential identity of David's kingdom with that of Christ, all becomes plain and natural. The kingdom over which David presides is the true kingdom of God; and, for this reason, it shall be established forever, with David's offspring on the throne. The magnificent promises made to David concerning his house, have respect to his entire royal line from Solomon to Christ, taken as a whole, not to Solomon alone, or to Solomon and his successors on the earthly throne of Israel; and they are promises which have for their ground the appointment of David's family to the headship of the visible church.

In interpreting the promise of God to David by Nathan, and the numerous subsequent prophecies that are based upon it, we must be careful to avoid the two opposite extremes of excluding the descendants of David who succeeded him on the earthly throne, and of limiting our view to them. The promise: "And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name," manifestly refers to Solomon; the words which immediately follow: "And I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever," show that the reference is not to Solomon in his simple personality, but to Solomon as the head, after David, of a royal line that is to be perpetuated forever. In one word, it is to the *headship* of the visible church that these promises are made; and since this headship includes a line of earthly kings (exiled indeed for a period from the throne, as a chastisement for its sins, but not finally rejected), and terminating in Christ the King of kings, it follows that a series of prophecies which has respect to the history and development of the church under the entire line, the earthly heads as well as the heavenly Head in whom David's line terminates, must naturally contain expressions which apply:

First, to the earthly kings alone, such as the following: "If he commit iniquity, I will chastise him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men."¹ For without these the picture could not be complete. The conduct of the earthly heads has a true bearing on the history of God's dealings with his people, and ought, therefore, to be brought into view.

Secondly, to Christ alone, since his office infinitely transcends that of any of his earthly predecessors, and he must have attributes and perform works which cannot be ascribed to them in any sense. As an example we may take the following words of Isaiah: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever."²

¹ 2 Sam. 7: 14.² Isa. 9: 6, 7.

Thirdly, to the earthly kings in a lower, and to Christ in a higher sense; since there is a common idea which belongs to the office of both, and therefore truly includes both. Here belongs the declaration: "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son."¹ The prerogative of sonship belonged to the kings of David's line in so far as they were, by a special act of God's sovereignty, taken into a peculiar relation to himself, and invested with an indefeasible title to the headship of his visible church. "If children, then heirs," so the Apostle reasons; and his argument applies alike to the believer's title to heaven, and to the title of David's children to the throne of Israel. But, over and above all this, Christ, the last heir of David, in whom his kingdom is perpetuated forever, is the Son of God in a high and incommunicable sense; and, in the same high and incommunicable sense, is he the "heir of all things."²

And here it is pertinent to show in what sense David and his successors on the earthly throne constituted a true type of Christ. They were such both in their *headship*, and their *sonship*. It belongs to the nature of a type that it shadow forth something higher than itself.³ It was the true kingdom of God, the church in her visible organized form, over which they reigned, and to the headship of which they had, as the earthly sons of God, an inalienable title. But neither in their headship could they approach to the infinite fulness of Christ, whom God hath given to be "the head over all things to the church;" nor in their sonship could they do anything more than represent in a typical way the sonship of him who dwelt from eternity in the bosom of the Father. Just as the priesthood of Melchisedek and that of Aaron and his sons typified the higher priesthood of Christ, so did the headship and sonship of David's royal line typify the headship and sonship of him who was both the Root and Offspring, both the Lord and the Son of David. But here there is a very noticeable difference which must be carefully kept in mind. Christ was not the *successor* of either Melchisedek or Aaron in the priestly office. That he was not the successor of Melchisedek is manifest; for a principal point of agreement between Melchisedek and Christ lay in the fact that the former

¹ 2 Sam. 7: 14.

² Heb. 1: 2.

³ It is in this sense that the law of Moses, especially the ritual part of it, is called "a shadow of good things to come." Heb. 10: 1.

was "without descent,"¹ that is, as Robinson well expresses it, "a priest not by right of sacerdotal descent, but by the grace of God." That he was not the successor of Aaron is yet plainer; because he was "after the order of Melchisedek," and not "after the order of Aaron;" and one "whose descent is not counted" from Aaron.² The priesthood of Melchisedek and that of Aaron, having accomplished their appointed end, that of prefiguring Christ in his priestly office, passed away forever.

But in his kingly office Christ is not "without descent;" but is "of the house and lineage of David;" and the throne which he occupies is "the throne of his father David." The kingdom over which David reigned, since it embosomed in itself the true visible church of God, was not so much a *type* of the kingdom of Christ as that kingdom itself, although in a less spiritual form. But David's *presidency* over that kingdom, since it could only shadow forth the fulness of Christ's kingly office, was truly typical of that office. So also was the relation of sonship which he and his successors on the earthly throne held to God, typical of the high and incommunicable relation which Christ holds to the Father as his only begotten Son. Christ is, therefore, in his kingly office, both the great Antitype of David, and also his true lineal successor. David, again (and in David his earthly successors who reigned on Mount Zion), is, as the divinely constituted earthly head of the visible church, both the type of Christ, and his true predecessor; the kingdom of grace, which was, as has been shown, the very substance of David's kingdom, being, from Abraham to the archangel's trump, one and indivisible.

This view of the relation of David's family to the Messiah renders the interpretation of those prophecies which are based on the original promise to David very plain and simple. We are not under the necessity of anxiously inquiring what belongs to David's kingdom and what to Christ's, as if the two kingdoms were distinct from each other; or as if, at most, the kingdom of David were only a shadowy *type* of the Messiah's kingdom. It is of one and the same kingdom, unchanged in its inward essence, under all changes of outward form, invincible in its nature, and everlasting in its duration, of which these prophecies speak. What parts of them apply exclusively to its earthly rulers and

¹ Gr. *ἀγενεαλόγητος*, without genealogy; not so much one whose genealogy is unknown, as one whose genealogy is not taken into account.

² Hebrews, seventh chapter, *passim*.

its temporary national form, and what to its Divine Head and its final ecumenical form, can be, in general, determined without difficulty from a consideration of the subject-matter. But the main body of them consider this kingdom in its imperishable, invincible nature and high prerogative, as one established and sustained by the power of God, and destined successively to encounter and overcome every form of opposition from without and corruption from within; till, under the headship of the Messiah, it shall attain to universal dominion over all nations, and fill the earth with knowledge, holiness and happiness. Here nice distinctions between David and Christ are entirely out of place. It is to the kingdom of David, in so far as it contains in itself the visible church, of which Christ is, from the beginning to the end of time, the central life-giving power, that the promises are made. David's family are, by God's appointment, constituted the earthly rulers of this church. As such, they are, *so long as they remain true to their office*, acting in her behalf; all their victories over the surrounding hostile nations are her victories; and, since she is invincible, they are invincible also.

Their triumphs are not only earnest and pledges of her final triumph over all the earth, but are themselves a part of that triumph. The words of God: "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion,"¹ although they have their highest fulfilment in Christ, have yet a true application to them as Christ's predecessors on the throne of David, and placed, by Divine appointment, at the head of a kingdom which must stand firm against all the assaults of its enemies, and endure to the end of time. But, *if they prove false to their high office*, and turn the power wherewith God has entrusted them for the welfare of his church against her, he will violently thrust them down from their kingly dignity; but will preserve the throne of their father David for David's last and great successor, in whom every promise made to David's house shall find a perfect fulfilment.

¹ Psalm 2: 6.

ARTICLE V.

EXCURSION TO THE LAKES EAST OF DAMASCUS.

By Rev. J. L. Porter, Missionary at Damascus.

[THIS Article, like the one on Hermon in the preceding number of this work, is from the pen of one of the Missionaries of the Irish Presbyterian Church stationed at Damascus. Mr. Porter has paid great attention to the topography and antiquities of the district round about that ancient city, and has constructed an accurate map of the region. The present Article gives us the first definite information respecting the lakes and marshes which receive the waters of the Barada and the 'Awaj, the two rivers of Damascus.—E. R.]

November 17th, 1852. Long had my mind been set on an excursion to the unknown regions on the east of Damascus; but never till this day was I able to accomplish it. A cessation of hostilities on the part of the government, opened my way. So I got up a strong party, engaged a competent guide, and we set off from the east gate at 6.57. Our party consisted of Messrs. Robson and Barnett, and M. Antôn Bulâd, a learned monk of the Greek Catholic church.

The air was fresh and frosty, and blew keenly in our faces as we rode along the bank of the Akrahâny, a canal from the Barada. Ere long, however, the rising sun dissolved the congealed vapor from the grass and foliage, and lighted up the distant hills, so that they appeared like gigantic gilded domes rising over the forests of the plain. A cloud covered the top of Hermon, and the deep sound of the thunder was heard in the distance; we consequently feared some approaching change. But as the day advanced, every cloud disappeared; and every hill and mountain round the whole horizon, stood forth in bold relief against the clear blue sky. It was a glorious day. But why speak of the weather in the sunny East? Amid the clouds and gloom of old England, or the showers of the Emerald Isle, or the mists of Scotland, the weather may form a topic of conversation. A glorious November day would there be, indeed, a *rara avis*. But in Syria, where for six long months the deep azure of the heavens and the bright beams of the sun are never once dimmed by a passing cloud—why speak here of a glorious day? However, it was glorious even for Syria. The atmosphere was transparent as crystal; a

passing shower had dispelled the quivering haze that looms over the desert during the summer heats; the magic power of the mirage did not convert burning sands and parched plains into placid lakes with verdant isles; nature was seen as it existed.

We followed the ordinary eastern road for some distance, and then, turning a little to the right, passed near Jeramâna, and had Balât on our right at 7.50. Five minutes later, we entered Melha, where a few columns along the streets, some hewn stones in the walls of the mud houses, and two or three sarcophagi in the gardens, tell plainly of other and more prosperous ages. Eighteen minutes more through orchards and fruitful fields brought us to Zibdin. Continuing in the same course we reached at 8.35 a large fountain called 'Ain Hârûsh. This is the largest fountain in the plain of Damascus. A fine stream flows from it, in a shallow Wady, away to the eastward, and waters five large villages with their gardens and fields.

Our road lay along the left bank of the rivulet. At 8.50 we had on our left, distant ten minutes, the small village Biztneh, and about fifteen minutes beyond it Harista el-Kantarah, and further still, beyond the Barada, Tell es-Salahiyeh. At 9 o'clock we crossed the Hârûsh by a good stone bridge, and seven minutes after entered Nôleh. Here I stopped ten minutes to make some observations. Damascus bore from this N. 55 W. This bearing, therefore, indicates accurately the direction of our route hitherto. Tell Salahiyeh bore N. 23 E. We were objects of curiosity to the villagers, whom we found sullen, and unwilling to answer our questions. Some women, who were washing in the stream, stated in reply to me, that they did not know the name of the village; a lie so barefaced that I was astonished at it, even with a two years' experience of Arab character. A black slave at last gave me the information I sought. A few minutes above the village, the Hârûsh is divided into two branches; one branch, that on the south, waters Nôleh, Dulbeh, Judeidet el-Khâs, and Kefrein; the other is carried to Harrân el-'Awâmid.

Leaving the village we entered at once on the open plain. The forest-gardens were left behind, the thick shade of the walnut, still fresh and green, was felt no more; and little intervals of waste land began to appear between the cultivated fields. A broad plain was spread out before us, with here and there a village surrounded by its orchards. At 9.45 we had Dulbeh on

our right, distant about twenty minutes; and on our left, about an equal distance, Deir Sulmân, and beyond it, Blaliyeh. Leaving the village of Kefrein on our right, we reached Harrân el-Awâmid at 10.50. In the centre of this village, and unconnected, so far as now appears, with any other building, stand three large Ionic columns of basalt. They have pedestals about six feet high; and the height of the whole from the ground to the top of the capital I estimated at forty feet. The circumference of the shaft is eleven feet six inches. One of the columns stands at a right angle to the line of the other two, and the distances between them are not equal. It is impossible to say of what character the building was to which these were attached; but, judging from the proportions and workmanship of these solitary pillars, it must have been of considerable beauty. In every part of the village we observed large quantities of hewn stones, with broken shafts. The place was manifestly one of some importance in former days.

From the roof of the house beside the columns I got a good view of this eastern portion of the plain; and I got my first *near* prospect of the lakes. My attention was now directed, as it had been at Maksûra, to the three ruined buildings beyond them. One of these appeared large and lofty; it bore N. 82 E. The Arabs around us spoke in extravagant terms of their extent, and the beauty of some of the white stones in them. When we proposed to visit them, all refused to accompany us, and said that a hundred horsemen could not conduct us in safety. We heard this with sorrow, for to visit them was one of the objects of our present journey.

Eastward of the village we could now distinguish extensive marshes, with here and there patches of clear water. The marshes commence about a quarter of an hour below the village. On the south they extend to the village of Judeidet el-Khâs, an hour distant, bearing S. 23 W.; and in the opposite direction they stretch away quite to 'Ataibeh, a little over an hour N. 55 E. The whole of this tract is deeply covered with water during the winter and spring months. Small portions become dry towards the close of summer, and by far the larger part marsh. Forests of tall reeds cover nearly the whole surface, and these hide the places where the water is deep and clear; but from the commanding position we now occupied we could still see a number of clear spots. From this cause I could easily understand how

an individual might pay a hurried visit to Harrân, and yet see no lake whatever, and conclude that the whole had dried up. The feathery tops of the reeds were dry enough looking, but by approaching them, as I did in several places, I soon became convinced that there was water. This, then, is the western side of the *Bahret el-Kiblîyeh*, or Southern Lake. The other sides, and its extent, will be considered in their proper place.

We mounted at 10.40, and rode straight to the village of 'Ataibeh. We had the marshes close on our right the whole way; and in some places we were obliged to make a detour to the west, to avoid the deep waters. In thirty-five minutes we forded, not without some difficulty, the principal branch of the Barada, a little above the spot where it flows into a considerable expanse of clear water in the midst of the marshes. Now one point which I had wished to establish was so far ascertained; that is, *that the Barada is not, at least every autumn, exhausted before it reaches this lake.* The present season, too, had been unusually dry; little snow had fallen during the previous winter; and there had been no rain since April, save a slight passing shower. On this account I am inclined to believe the universal testimony of the peasants in this region, that *the Barada always flows into this lake.* Of course I cannot assert this broadly, and generally. If any person had ever examined the several branches of the Barada and found them dry, then his proof would be unanswerable. But this, I think, has never yet been done.

Another point was also now established, namely, that this lake does not always, or generally, dry up in summer. There is not, it is true, any very large expanse of clear water; but there is some, and there are marshes of great extent.

At 12.45 we reached 'Ataibeh, having forded the other principal branch of the Barada just before entering the village. This place is almost completely encompassed with a little lake, and below it are the marshes, with ponds of water at intervals.

Having partaken of a hasty lunch, we left our servants, took a guide, and proceeded to examine the northern borders of the South Lake, and make a hasty survey of the East Lake (*Bahret esh-Shûrkiyeh*) which we had not yet seen. We mounted at 2.35, rode round the little sheet of water, and struck nearly eastward over swelling ground. The depression and reeds of the South Lake were close on our right. In half an hour we reached a deep and wide trench, so regular that it

would almost seem to be artificial, though it is not so. It was now dry, but through this in winter and spring the surplus water of the lake on the south flows into that on the north. The distance between them at this point cannot be much less than a mile; though, from the inequality of the ground, they in some places approach nearer; and when the water is very high, in one narrow Wady they actually touch each other. This junction, however, does not make the two lakes one. Judging from the elevation of by far the greater part of the ground, as well as from the statements of the guide, it is my conviction that there is *always* a tract of dry ground between the two, varying from half a mile to a mile in breadth. The depression of the ground on our right was now not less than from thirty to forty feet. We saw several deep wells as we rode along; and our Damascus guide pointed out one, into which he and his horse had once fallen while in pursuit of a wild boar.

At 3.20 we reached a small Tell in great part covered with graves, some of which are of comparatively recent date. This Tell is called Tell Maktel Mûsa, "The hill where Moses was slain." We could hear of no tradition attached to the spot; but the situation corresponds in every respect to the place called Merj Râhet, by Abulfeda.¹ He states that a battle was fought A. H. 64, between the Yemeniyeh and Kaisiyeh, in which Merwân, the chief of the Yementiyeh, gained the victory. The field of battle he describes as being in the Ghûtah of Damascus, toward the east. The ancient tombs, the name of the little hill, and the position, all tend to suggest the idea that this may be the spot referred to by the historian.

From this point 'Ataibeh bore N. W. and Maksûra N. 15 E. The South Lake extended still about an hour and a half to the S. E. by E.; and then the border of it swept round southward. We had from this spot a still nearer view of those strange ruins eastward. On the far side of the lakes, the ground slopes gently upward to the base of the group of conical hills called the Tellâl. The surface is slightly undulating, resembling that between the lakes, and like it, too, nearly covered with large shrubs of the tamarisk. Along this slope, more than half way to the hills, stand the *Diûra*. They are not close together. There must be an interval of at least seven miles between the northern and southern Deir. The centre one is considerably further east than

¹ Tab. Syr. Ed. Reis. p. 16.

the other. The distance of the nearest, that on the north, I estimated, from this spot, at two hours (our guide said four); and the Tellûl at about four and a half to five hours. The loftiest conical peak of the Tellûl is called *Dûkrveh*.

Neither in the plains nor mountains beyond the lakes could I see any other ruins. There are now no inhabitants there; and, so far as I was able to observe and ascertain, there are no ruined villages. The villagers seldom venture beyond the marshes, and the wandering Arabs dread the long guns of these hardy peasants. There is a constant blood-feud between the parties, and this accounts for their unwillingness to go with us beyond their own territory. The *Diûra* are, I think, unquestionably the "places that protect from an enemy," spoken of by Abulfeda¹ as situated near the Lake of Damascus. It is probable, that these constituted part of a line of fortresses erected along the eastern border of this region, to check the incursions of the desert hordes. We had before seen a strong fortress east of the village of *Maksûra*, beside a ruined city; and we had likewise observed a small tower some distance south of it. Near the Lake *Heijâny* we shall also see other large ruins, apparently of a similar character.

South of Tell *Maktel Mûsa* is a deeper portion of the first lake, which in winter and spring is filled with water, but now it was nearly dry. This is called *Bahret Maktel Mûsa*. We turned away northward from this little hill to visit *Bahret esh-Shûrktyeh*. In ten minutes we reached another Tell, also covered with Arab graves. The sons of the desert rest here in solitude after a life of wandering. It is very striking in such a place, where there are no traces of man's presence, to find evidences of his mortality. The daring marauder, and the brave warrior, rest here; we rode over their graves in peace, for death had paralyzed the strong arm, and removed from earth the fierce spirit. The Tell is encircled by a grove of the tamarisk, which here attains a height of from six to eight feet, and is generally ten or twelve in diameter. It is called *Tûrfa* by the Arabs. This is almost the only product of the soil; which is covered in the intervals with a whitish crust.

In fifteen minutes more we reached the side of the East Lake, now presenting a vast surface of waving canes, with little clear spots, here and there. As the place where we stood was some-

¹ Tab. Syr. p. 157.

what elevated, I was able to form a pretty good idea of its extent. Its southern border stretches away E. by S. for about an hour. It then sweeps round northward with an irregular curve to the east. The breadth to the northern side is about two hours. On our left hand the border runs away to the N. W. for about two hours, greatly indented from the inequality of the ground. The circumference I would thus estimate at nearly ten hours; not at our mode of riding, as I estimated the other lake along the side of which we travelled; but at the usual reckoning of the peasants, making the hour about equivalent to two miles. Our guide assured us that it would require a day to encompass it; and I think he spoke correctly. Taking the rate of progress at two miles an hour, and the day ten hours, this would give a circuit of *twenty miles*, which is near the truth. Our purpose had been to pass between these lakes, visit the Diûra, and then take the route outside the south lake to Heijâny. In this it will be seen we were disappointed; but we were, nevertheless, enabled fully to solve the mystery of these lakes, and clearly to see the general features of this region. It may be, that on some future occasion, I shall be enabled to penetrate to the Diûra, and perhaps also scale Tell Dûkweh beyond.

We continued some distance N. W. along the side of the marshes, and then turned into them by a winding path through the thickets of canes. In about fifteen minutes we reached a mound called Tell el-Khanzir, the "Tell of the Swine." Beside this was deep water. Dismounting and leaving my horse, I followed our guide in among the reeds, through which we had difficulty in forcing our way. They are here from twelve to fifteen feet high, and many of them over twenty. I wished to get sight of a wild boar; but, though we found places where they had been recently wallowing, we could see none. As we crouched down listening, the guide told me in whispers, that on the previous year he had lost his way near this spot, and was three days and three nights among the thickets and marshes ere he could get out. I can well believe it, for nothing save a small section of the blue sky can be seen, and, if once the track is lost, the wanderer at once gets entangled among the marshes; and, even should he know something of the right direction, he is forced to turn and wind to avoid the pools and morasses. On hearing this, I at once proposed to go back; as I had no fancy for an adventure in such a place, even with the prospect of enjoying the society

of a few wild boars. Returning to our horses, therefore, we remounted, and set out for 'Ataibeh. We recrossed the dry bed of the connecting canal, and reached the village as the sun was sinking behind the lofty Hermon.

The eastern lake is chiefly supplied with water by the channel above referred to. There is another stream, however, which flows into it from the Barada above 'Ataibeh. It likewise receives the superfluous waters of the large canal called the Taura, augmented by the streams from 'Ain Kossair. These run down from the village of 'Adra into its western extremity. On the north, during the winter, it receives also the stream of the Nahr el-Mukubrit, coming from near Ruhaibeh, on the plain of Jerûd, and passing Maksûra in its course.

When dinner was laid, not on the table, however, we proceeded to discuss the eatables, and at the same time the proposed journey to the Diûra. A number of the villagers were now squatting round us, wondering at the facility with which we introduced the little spears (forks) into our mouths; and thinking, no doubt, what fools the *Frangis* are to endanger their faces with such weapons, when they have fingers, and might use them, like other men. The whole proceeding was manifestly to them a mystery, and many a nudge did they give each other, as some new feat was performed with the knife and fork; but their amazement found no expression, save in an occasional muttered "Wullah."

Our Damascus guide was evidently averse to our proceeding further east. If fear of danger were the cause, as it appeared, he ought undoubtedly to have been the last to give in on that head; for when mounted, he resembled, in the completeness and number of his arms, a well-appointed light field-battery. We tried our own powers of persuasion with the peasants, holding forth strong inducements in the shape of a liberal *bûkskish*, to any five men who would accompany us. It was all in vain. Druzes, Arabs, and robbers of all kinds, were now, they said, prowling along the borders of the desert, awaiting a favorable opportunity to plunder and run. We were thus compelled to relinquish our design.

November 18th. We returned this morning by the same road we had travelled before, to Harrân el-Amâmid, which we reached at 8.35. Spurring my horse to a gallop, I followed the indentations of the lake, leaving my companions to pursue the direct

route. I found deep water among the reeds at every point. Myriads of wild fowl, geese, ducks, storks, herons, snipes, and many others, rose in clouds and flew around me; while numerous less swift species paddled away along the water, or dived in the pools. Below Harrân one of the branches of the Hârûsh falls into the lake. We rode on to Kefrein, and reached it in fifteen minutes. It bears S. 44 W. from the former. Here we turned a few points to the south, and passed over a fine plain with rich soil, but only partially cultivated, to Judeidet el-Khâs, forty minutes from Kefrein. A branch of the Hârûsh runs past the village and falls into the lake below. As we rode along this last stage, the edge of the marshes was more distant from our path than formerly. I galloped down to them and still found the water as before. The lake from this sweeps round in a curve to the village. A swell in the ground prevents it from going further west, between Kefrein and Judeideh.

I here spent five minutes in taking bearings to fix the position of this village and of the southern boundary of the lake. The extreme southern border of Bahret el-Kibliyeh is marked by a line drawn from hence E. by S. So far as I could judge from this and from observations made afterward on Tell Heijâny, I would estimate the breadth at an hour and three quarters. It is not quite so wide as at the other extremity. The length of this lake then we have seen to be, from north to south, two hours; and the breadth of it averaging nearly two. This gives a circuit of six hours, which, at our rate of travel, will represent nearly twenty miles, or a little less than the circumference of the other lake.

Leaving Judeideh we rode south straight to Heijâneh. There is a rise of more than thirty feet which we ascended immediately after leaving the former. This swell runs away S. E. by E. and prevents the extension of the lake further south. The soil is here of the finest quality, with a perfectly flat surface. The conglomerate and limestone strata give place to the basalt near Judeideh, and the latter runs unbroken away beyond the mountains of the Haurân. There are in this part of the plain occasional small mounds or Tells, in some of which the black porous rock crops out over the mouldy soil. Here again begins the tamarisk, and another plant called *Kily* (*Salsola fruticosa*), which is burned, and the ashes used in the manufacture of soap. It is a sapless looking plant of a dusky green color. It somewhat

resembles the rush, but is more straggling and has thicker stems with numerous joints. It grows from twelve to fifteen inches high. It abounds in this part of the plain, also around Maksûra, and in the mountains between that village and the plain of Jerûd.

At 10.23 we reached Heijâny, and rode at once to the summit of the little volcanic hill, that rises up immediately beyond the village. Judeideh bears from this place due north. This Tell commands a fine prospect over the whole surrounding country. On the N. and N. E. is seen the Ghûtah, with its evergreen forests; and the Merj teeming with villages; the flat surface of the lakes, and the undulating ground beyond rising up with an easy slope to the foot of the Tellâl. The two border villages, 'Ataibeh and Maksûra, were now seen in a line, bearing N. 27 E. It is rather singular, that the three most remote villages in this plain should be in a direct line. The group of hills so often referred to, called Tellâl, are three and a half to four hours in length from north to south. The conical peak called Dûkweh, is near the centre of the range and bears N. 83 E. From Maksûra it bore S. $37\frac{1}{2}$ E.; and from Tell es-Salahiyeh S. 70 E. These bearings will fix its position with a pretty near approach to accuracy. Both on the north and south of these hills, the flat surface of the earth stretches away till it meets the horizon. From the southern extremity of the Tellâl to the commencement of the Jebel Haurân, about S. 13 E., there is also an unbounded plain. Only one solitary blue peak, rising up in the far distance, S. 62 E., breaks the uniformity; this peak, our intelligent guide informed me, is in the centre of the *Safa*. On the south a vast plain extends to the base of the Haurân mountains. The villages of Heit and Hiyât were pointed out, and appeared as black spots on the hill side; and I distinctly saw a lofty Tell, forming the northern extremity of the Haurân range; and on visiting that region afterwards, I at once recognized it as Tell Ma'az, near the ruins of Bathanyeh, the ancient *Butanaa*. On the S. W. we could overlook the rolling plain to the Lejah; and, far away, above the flat rocky surface of this district, rose a blue peak, which I afterwards identified as Tell Amâra, beside the village of 'Ahiry.

More to the west the view was shut in by the heights of Ma-ni'a. The eastern termination of this range bore S. 80 W. The villages of 'Adaliyeh and Hurjilleh, in the valley of the 'Awaj,

between Māni'a and Jebel el-Aswad, were visible, bearing N. 78 W. This bearing, too, marks the *general* direction of the river 'Awaj.

The Lake Heijāny lies on the S. and S. E. of the Tell. It extends about two hours southward, but towards the east not quite so far. Its circumference I estimated at about five hours. It was now entirely dry, but the waving reeds and the color of the soil marked distinctly the boundaries of the water during the winter. We were informed that it rarely dries up completely. The river 'Awaj enters this lake at its north-western angle, about twenty minutes below the place where we stood. I could plainly trace its winding course through the undulating plain, from the spot where it passes out from between the hills above mentioned. Its bed was now quite dry to near that point. A winter torrent, called the Liwa, falls into the S. W. corner of this lake. Its source is near the village of Himreh in the Ard el-Bathanyeh. From thence it runs westward in a deep Wady to Shuhba, where it sweeps round to the north and follows the indentations of the Lejah to its N. E. angle at Burāk; there it turns more to the east, and winds across a fine plain to the lake. It only flows when the snow is melting in the mountains, or heavy rain is falling. I travelled along it in February last from Burāk to near its source, and only found water, here and there, in pools.

About half an hour south of Tell Heijāny is a small mound covered with ruins, called Kaserein; and beyond the lake, S. 15 E., is another much larger mound with ruins on its summit, said to resemble the Diûra. It is called Mastabeh. There are likewise some ruins on a rising ground in the centre of the lake, called Beitariyeh. What is the character, and what were the objects of these buildings? Standing just beyond the border of civilization, the idea is suggested, Were they not fortresses to repel and prevent the incursions of the wandering tribes? Nothing but an examination of them can solve this query. If meant for defence, they are badly situated; for, instead of being in a line and at regular intervals, they are either grouped together, or placed the one behind the other.

The whole of this vast tract, south and east of the lakes, is now without a settled inhabitant. The Arabs roam over it freely. In the autumn it is parched and desolate, but in spring there is excellent pasturage; and then it is almost covered with the wide-spreading flocks of the Beni-Sūkhṛ and Wulid 'Aly.

I had now completed my survey of the eastern part of the plain of Damascus. I had visited the three most distant villages, Maksûra, 'Ataibeh and Heijâny, and had travelled some miles beyond the first and second. The impressions I had formerly received from the statements of natives, I found in part correct, and in part incorrect. It is true there are *three* lakes, and that those into which the Barada falls do not dry up. It is also true that the Lake Heijâny never meets the Bahret el-Kibliyah, for there is high ground between them at least an hour in breadth; and that, though the east and south lakes communicate, yet they never unite so as to form one. It is true that there are strange large ruins in the Lake Heijâny, and beyond the others. But it is not true that there are villages and inhabitants there. The information I previously got from Mr. Barnett, was strictly accurate, so far as it went; with the exception of the bearings, which I found often very incorrect.

The guide whom we took from the village Heijâny to the summit of the Tell, was very intelligent. He informed us that he had been with the Arabs in the *Safa*; and said that this district was like the Lejah, but larger, and more difficult of access. There are no hills around it, but a wall of jagged rocks. He added, that, if there were only water in it, the world could not expel the Arabs from its fastnesses, or go in to them. He pointed out to me the peak, which, he said, was in the centre of the rocks. The position of this differs very greatly from that given in Appendix, No. 6, to Burckhardt's Travels in Syria; where it is said that the "northern part of the Jebel Haurân is called Es-Safa." Now the Jebel Haurân terminates toward the north at Tell Ma'az, which bears from Heijâny about S. 13 E.; whereas the hill in the Safa bears S. 62 E., and must be at least a day's journey N. E. of the northern extremity of the Haurân mountains. It is, as I was informed, more than a day's journey from Heijâny. During my excursion in the Haurân in February last, I made particular inquiries as to the position of the Safa, when I visited Hit and Shuka; and I was there informed, that it is *a day's journey N. E.* of these places. Had it been where Burckhardt, or his editor, has placed it, and where Berghaus has sketched it on his map, I must unquestionably have seen it; for from the height above Bathanyeh I overlooked the whole of the plain from the west to within a few points of the east. I have no hesitation in stating, that this singular district is not where

Burckhardt has described it, and Berghaus has laid it down. I also feel confident that its true position is as I have stated above.

Another statement in the Appendix of Burckhardt is likewise incorrect. He says: "At the end of the Ghûtah or Merj of Damascus begins the Jebel Haurân, which takes a south direction." The end of the Ghûtah is only two hours from Damascus, and the Merj terminates at the lakes, where there are no mountains whatever. The nearest are the Tellûl, about four and a half hours distant. From Tell Heijâny to the northern part of Jebel Haurân is about *eleven hours* of an unbroken plain. The mountain ridge on the north of the plain of Damascus runs along the edge of the desert to Palmyra; but I have never heard the name Ruak applied to it. The name given to me at Maksûra was *Jebel el-Kaus*. Berghaus, while endeavoring to follow Burckhardt, has yet applied the name Ruak to quite another range of hills, lying between the plains of Jerûd and Yabrûd. He has not at all laid down the real Ruak of Burckhardt, which is a parallel range but much further southward. The Jebel el-Abiad, referred to in the Appendix above mentioned, is the lofty mountain-chain on the north side of the great plain, that extends from Palmyra to Kuryetein.

Such, then, is the physical aspect of this region, so far as I have had opportunity of exploring it. My opportunities have been certainly greater than those enjoyed by most travellers; for I have traversed the whole country from Palmyra to Bozra along the borders of the deserts. I feel, however, that there is still much to be done in the way of careful survey.

Returning from the Tell to the village, we partook of a hasty lunch, and mounting our horses rode towards Damascus. We started at 1.5, and continued for an hour across a fine plain in a direction N. 72 W. The 'Awaj was only a short distance on our left, but the bed of the stream was hidden from view by the inequality of the ground, and the tamarisk shrubs that almost completely cover it. We then swept round the base of a low Tell and rode straight to Ghuzlantiyeh, which bears from Heijâny N. 55 W. We reached it at 2.20, having crossed two little canals that bring to this place the water of the 'Awaj. Another half hour brought us to Karahta, in a line with the two former villages. We here turned S. 85 W., skirting a high mound, and struck across a well-cultivated plain to Tell Sultân Abn-Yezid, the summit of which we reached at 3.15.

This is the loftiest Tell on the plain of Damascus, and having a Wely on the summit, it forms a prominent point in taking bearings, or making a survey. It is also important as commanding a distinct view of the windings of the lower part of the river 'Awaj. The village of Nejha, at the eastern extremity of Jebel el-Aswad, appeared almost at our feet. It is about half an hour distant. Beyond it, fifteen minutes, is the 'Awaj, just leaving the vale between the latter ridge and Mâni'a. Half an hour further down it turns suddenly to the N. E. and sweeps round the base of a little hill, and then meanders across the plain to the lake. The meadows between Nejha and the bend of the river presented a gay and animated picture. A few battalions of Turkish soldiers were there encamped; while little parties wandered along the stream, or galloped about in the exciting exercise of the Jerid. These soldiers were posted here to check the incursions of the rebel Druzes into the plain of Damascus.

The ridge Jebel Mâni'a sinks down into a broad swell opposite Nejha, and is here crossed by the road that I afterward travelled to the Haurân. This swell soon after descends to the level of the plain.

We left at 3.30, passed Kübr es-Sit, fifteen minutes on our left, at 4.30, reached Akraha twenty-five minutes after, and entered the east gate of the city at 5.40.

EXCURSION TO KESWEH.

January 28th, 1853. We left the city at 9.45 by Buwâbet Ullah, "The Gate of God," and rode along the Haj road, now, in part, covered with water from the recent rains. In fifteen minutes we had on our left Kübbet el-Haj, a tomb, and small mosk around which the Mecca pilgrims spend the first night of their journey. On the opposite side of the road is the large village of Kadam. At 10.25 we saw on our left, a quarter of an hour distant, Sabinet es-Sughra, and ten minutes south of it, Sabineh. Twelve minutes afterwards we crossed a small stream running, in a deep artificial channel, toward the former little village. Its waters are collected, some distance westward, by means of a subterranean aqueduct. A quarter of an hour further we crossed another small stream called Nahr Sabineh from the village which it waters. It, too, is collected like the former, to the west of Ashrafiyeh. In eight minutes more we came to

the Berdy, a stream in every respect like the preceding. It does not rise on the side of Hermon, as represented in Berghaus's map; nor at Katana, as laid down on Burckhardt's. Its waters are collected like the two already mentioned; and the head of its canal is just twenty minutes west of the road, and five minutes above the Druze village Ashrafiyeh. It never flows either to the lakes of the Barada, or the lake Hejjāny; it waters the village Baweidah, about an hour east of the road, and is exhausted in the gardens and fields below it. This stream has no more right to be inserted in a map than a hundred others in different parts of the plain.

A smart canter of eight minutes from the Berdy, brought us to the foot of Jebel el-Aswad. The great Haj road so far is wide and good. It is wide, like most other roads on the plain of Damascus, because there are no fences along its sides, and the mules and camels are rather erratic in their progress; and it is good, just because it is impossible for it to be bad, the plain being flat and the ground firm. It runs from the city gate in a straight line S. 28 W. to the base of the hills. Here it turns a little westward, skirting a hill on the left. On reaching the top of the gentle slope it turns again nearly due south. The road along the whole of this elevated ground is covered with loose fragments of trap-rock. On its eastern side the hills rise up suddenly, but not precipitously; while on the right the ground slopes away gradually into a fine fertile plain. A low spur shoots out westward from the place where the road begins to ascend, and separates this from the main plain. The village of Sahnaya, twenty minutes distant, stands at its extremity.

The low range of Jebel el-Aswad runs from this eastward to Nejha, and is intersected diagonally by three distinct Wadys. The breadth of the base of these hills is from one half to three quarters of an hour, and the greatest elevation above the plain does not exceed 500 feet. On the western side of the Haj road the main body of the hills appears as if it had been lifted from its place and set down half an hour further south. The vale above mentioned occupies its place. The ground immediately on each side of the road is stony, but does not present the rugged appearance one would suspect from reading Burckhardt.¹ The Meghâret el-Haramiyeh, or "Robbers Cave," mentioned by the same writer, is not very remarkable, and any traveller might

¹ Travels in Syria, p. 53.

well be excused for passing it unnoticed. Perhaps I should have done so, had it not been that a negro shepherd was standing beside it, and occasionally turning the wanderers of his flock, by slinging stones at them. The precision with which he could throw his missiles with this apparently unmanageable instrument, afforded a good illustration of that striking incident in the life of David, when the champion of Gath fell before him.

At 11.30 we commenced the gentle descent into the vale of the 'Awaj, down which we could see to Nejha. 'Adaliyeh and Hurjilleh were both in sight on the right bank. The road here runs S. by W. along the foot of the hills to Kesweh. These hills are sometimes called Jebel Kesweh. They are not regular like a chain, but are rather composed of a clump of conical peaks with narrow vales between. At 12.10 we reached Kesweh. The village stands on the north bank of the stream.

The 'Awaj approaches this place from the west, flowing in a deep and tortuous channel. On its southern side is an elevated rocky plateau, that extends nearly as far east as the Haj road. It then gives place to a fertile plain called Ard el-Khiyarah. On the same side of the river, E. by S. of the village, rise up suddenly the lofty peaks of the Jebel Mani'a. The highest summit is in part isolated and resembles a truncated cone. As this is a conspicuous object from the whole plain of Damascus, I was anxious to ascend it. We accordingly got a guide, and crossing the river by the fine stone bridge, were on the top in forty minutes. A large fortress stood here in ancient times, but is now heaps of ruins. The view is magnificent, embracing the whole district of Wady el-'Ajam, the plain of Jeidûr, the Lejah to the Jebel Haurân, and the vast expanse from Damascus to the Tel-lûl. My attention was especially confined to the 'Awaj. It lay spread out before me from Sa'sa' to the lake. First running N. E. toward Damascus, then turning and flowing in a serpentine course to Kesweh, where, fringed with willows and poplars, it makes a graceful curve northward round the base of the hill at my feet, and meanders through the meadows of the vale to Nejha. A canal taken from it at Kesweh, and carried along the slopes, waters Adaliyeh and Hurjilleh with their gardens and orchards.

After roughly sketching the whole panorama, and taking bearings of the principal villages and points, we descended and galloped back to Damascus.

Damascus, May, 1853.

ARTICLE VI.

THE NATURE AND INFLUENCE OF THE HISTORIC SPIRIT.

An Inaugural Discourse, by William G. T. Shedd, Professor at Andover.

THE purpose of an Inaugural Discourse is, to give a correct and weighty impression of the importance of some particular department of knowledge. Provided the term be employed in the technical sense of Aristotle and Quintilian, the Inaugural is a demonstrative oration, the aim of which is to justify the existence of a specific professorship, and to magnify the specific discipline which it imparts. It must, consequently, be the general object of the present discourse to praise the department, and recommend the study, of history.

As we enter upon the field which opens out before us, we are bewildered by its immense expanse. The whole hemisphere overwhelms the eye. The riches of the subject embarrass the discussion. For history is the most comprehensive of all departments of human knowledge. In its unrestricted and broad signification, it includes all other branches of human inquiry. Everything in existence has a history, though it may not have a philosophy, or a poetry; and, therefore, history covers and pervades and enfolds all things as the atmosphere does the globe. Its subject-matter is all that man has thought, felt, and done, and the line of Schiller is true even if taken in its literal sense: the final judgment is the history of the world.¹ If it were desirable to bring the whole encyclopaedia of human knowledge under a single term, certainly history would be chosen as the most comprehensive and elastic of all. And if we consider the mental qualifications required for its production, the department whose nature and claims we are considering, still upholds its superiority, in regard to universality and comprehensiveness. The historic talent is inclusive of all other talents. The depth of the philosopher, the truthfulness and solemnity of the theologian, the dramatic and imaginative power of the poet, are all necessary to the perfect historian, and would be found in him, at their height

¹ Resignation, Werke I. 98.

of excellence, did such a being exist. For it has been truly said, that we shall sooner see a perfect philosophy, or a perfect poem, than a perfect history.

We shall, therefore, best succeed in imparting unity to the discourse of an hour, and in making a single and, therefore, stronger impression, by restraining that career which the mind is tempted to make over the whole of this ocean-like arena, and confining our attention to a single theme.

It will be our purpose, then, to *speak*,

First, Of that peculiar spirit imparted to the mind of an educated man, by historical studies, which may be denominated the *historic spirit*; and

Secondly, Of its influence upon the theologian.

The historic spirit may be defined to be: the spirit of the race as distinguished from that of the individual, and of all time as distinguished from that of one age.

We here assume that the race is as much a reality as the individual; for this is not the time nor place, even if the ability were possessed, to reopen and reargue that great question which once divided the philosophic world into two grand divisions. We assume the reality of both ideas. We postulate the real and distinct, though undivided, being of the common humanity and the particular individuality. We are unable, with the Nominalist, to regard the former as the mere generalization of the latter. The race is more than an aggregate of separate individualities. History is more than a collection of single biographies, as the national debt is more than the sum of individual liabilities. Side by side, in one and the same subject; in every particular human person; exist the common humanity with its universal instincts and tendencies, and the individuality with its particular interests and feelings. The two often come into conflict with an earnestness, and at times in the epic of history with a terrible grandeur, that indicates that neither of them is an abstraction; that both are solid with the substance of an actual being, and throb with the pulses of an intense vitality.

The difference between history and biography involves the distinct entity and reality of both the race and the individual. Biography is the account of the peculiarities of the single person disconnected from the species, and is properly concerned only with that which is characteristic of him as an isolated individual. But that which is national and philanthropic in his nature; that

which is social and political in his conduct and career; all that links him with his species and constitutes a part of the development of man on the globe; all this is historical and not biographic. Speaking generally in order to speak briefly, all that activity which springs up out of the pure individualism of the person, makes up the charm and entertainment of biography, and all that activity which originates in the humanity of the person furnishes the matter and the grandeur of history.

History, then, is the story of the race. It is the exhibition of the common generic nature of man as this is manifested in that great series of individuals which is crowding on, one after another, like the waves of the sea, through the ages and generations of time. History omits and rejects everything in this march and movement of human beings that is peculiar to them as selfish units; everything that has interest for the man, but none for mankind; and inscribes upon her tablet only that which springs out of the common humanity, and hence has interest for all men and all time.

History, therefore, is *continuous* in its nature. It is so because its subject-matter is a continuity. This common human nature is in the process of continuous evolution, and the wounded snake drags its slow length along down the ages and generations. No single individual; no single age or generation; no single nationality, however rich and capacious; shows the whole of man, and so puts a stop to human development. The time will, indeed, come, and the generation and the single man, will one day be, in whom the entire exhibition will close. The number of individuals in the human race is predetermined and fixed by Him who sees the end from the beginning. But until the end of the series comes, the development must go on continuously, and history which is the account of it, must be continuous also. It must be linked with all that has gone before; it must be linked with all that is yet to come. As it requires the whole series of individuals, in order to a complete manifestation of the species, so it requires the whole series of ages and periods, in order to an entire history of it.

But while history is thus continuous in its nature, paradoxical as it may appear, it is at the same time *complete* in its spirit. Observe that we are speaking of the abstract and ideal character of the science; of that quality by which it differs from other branches of knowledge. We are not speaking of any one par-

ticular history that has actually been composed, or of all histories put together. History as actually written is not the account of a complete process, because, as we have just said, the development is still going on. Still, the *tendency* of the department is to a conclusion. History looks to a winding up. We may say of it, as Bacon says of unfulfilled prophecies: "though not fulfilled punctually and at once, it hath a springing and germinant accomplishment through many ages." History contains and defines general tendencies; it intimates, at every point of the line, a final consummation. The historical processes that have actually taken place, all point at, and join on upon, the future processes that are to be homogeneous with them. That very continuity in the nature of history, of which we have spoken, results in this completeness, or tendency to a conclusion, in its spirit. Like a growing plant, we know what it will come to, though the growth is not ended. For it is characteristic of an evolution, provided it is a genuine one, that seize it when you will, and observe it at any point you please, you virtually seize the whole; you observe it all. Each particular section of a development, exhibits the qualities of the whole process, and the organic part contemplated by itself, throbs with the general life. Hence it is that each particular history; of a nation, or an age, or a form of government, or a school of philosophy, or a Christian doctrine; when conceived in the spirit of history, wears a finished aspect, and sounds a full and fundamental tone. And hence the proverb: man is the same in all ages, and history is the repetition of the same lessons.

So universal and virtually complete in its spirit is history, that a distinguished modern philosopher has asserted that it may become a branch of *à priori* knowledge, and that it actually does become such in proportion as it becomes philosophic. Being the history, not of a dislocation, but of a development, and this of *one* race; being the exhibition of the unfolding of one single idea of the Divine mind; the history of the world, he contends, might be written beforehand by any mind that is master of the idea lying at the bottom of it. The whole course and career of the world, whose history is to be written, is predetermined by its plan, and supposing this to be known, the historian is more than the "prophet looking backward," as Schlegel calls him; he is the literal prophet. He does not merely inferentially foretell, by looking back into the past, but he sees the whole past and

future *simultaneously* present in the Divine idea of the world, of which by the hypothesis he is perfectly possessed.

This philosopher believed in the possibility of such an absolutely perfect and *à priori* history, because he taught that the mind of man and the mind of God are one universal mind, and that the entire knowledge of the one may consequently be possessed by the other. While, however, the philosopher erred fatally in supposing that any being but God the Creator, can be thus perfectly possessed of the organic idea of history, or that man can come into an approximate possession of it except as it is revealed to him by the Supreme mind, in providence and revelation, we must yet admit that the world is constructed according to such an idea or plan, and that for this reason, coherence, completeness and universality are the distinguishing characteristics of its history.

While, therefore, we deny that history as actually written, or as it shall be, comes up to this absolute and metaphysical perfection, it would be folly to deny that it has made any approximation towards it, or that it will make still more. So far as history has been composed under the guiding light of this divine idea, which is manifesting itself in the affairs of men; so far, in other words, as it has been written in the light of providence and revelation; it has been composed with truth, and depth, and power. Historians have been successful in gathering the lessons and solving the problems of history in proportion as they have recognized a providential plan in the career of the world, and have had some clear apprehension of it. The most successful particular histories seem to be parts of a greater whole. They have an easy reference to general history; evidently belong to it; evidently were written in its comprehensive spirit and by its broad lights. So much does history abhor a scattering, isolating and fragmentary method of treating the subject-matter belonging to it, that those histories which have been composed without any historic feeling; with no reference to the Divine plan and no connection with universal history; are the most dry and lifeless productions in literature. Want of connection, and the absence of a unifying principle, are more marked, and more painfully felt, in historical composition, than in any other species of literature. Even when the history is that of a brief period, or mere point, as it were, in universal space, the mind demands that it be rounded and finished in itself; that it exhibit, in little, that

same complete and coherent process, which is going on more grandly, on the wider arena of the world at large.

History, then, is the exhibition of the *species*. Its lessons may be relied upon as the conclusions to which the human race have come. In these historic lessons, the narrowness of individual and local opinions has been exchanged for the breadth and compass of public and common sentiments. The errors to which the single mind; the isolated unit, as distinguished from the organic unity, is exposed, are corrected by the sceptical and critical processes of the general mind.

What, for illustration, is the teaching of history in regard to the presence and relative proportions in a political constitution of the two opposite elements, permanence and progression?

Will not the judgment, in regard to this vexed question, that is formed on *historic* grounds, be, to say the least, safer and truer, than that formed upon the scanty experience of an individual man? Will not the decision of one who has made up his mind after a thoughtful study of the history of the ancient tyrannies and republics of Greece and Rome; of the republican States of Italy in the middle ages; of the political history of Europe since the formation of its modern State-system; be nearer the real truth than that of a pledged and zealous partisan, on either side of the question; than that of the ancient Cleon or Coriolanus; than that of the modern Rousseau or Filmer? And why will it be nearer the truth? Not merely because these men were earnest and zealous. Ardor and zeal are well in their place. But because these minds were individual and local; because they were not historic and general in views and opinions.

Take another illustration from the department of philosophy. A great variety of theories have been projected respecting the nature and operations of the human mind, so that it becomes difficult for the bewildered inquirer to know which he shall adopt. But will he run the hazard of fundamental error, if he assumes that that theory is the truth, so far as truth has been reached in this domain, which he finds substantially present in the philosophic mind in all ages? if he concludes that the historic philosophy is the true philosophy? And will it be safe for the individual to set up in this department, or in the still higher one of religion, doctrines which have either never entered the human mind before, or, if they have, have been only transient residents?

The fact is, no one individual mind is capable of accomplishing, alone and by itself, what the *race* is destined to accomplish only in the slow revolution of its cycle of existence. It is not by the thought of any one individual, though he were as profound as Plato and as intuitive as Shakspeare, that truth is to obtain an exhaustive manifestation. The whole race is to try its power, and, in the end, or rather at every point in the endless career, is to acknowledge that the absolute is not yet fully known; that the knowledge of man is still at an infinite distance from that of God.

Much has been said, and still is, of the spirit of the age; and extravagant expectations have been formed in regard to its insight into truth and its power of applying it for the progress of the species. But a single age is merely an individual of larger growth. There is always something particular, something local, something temporary, in every age, and we must not look here for the generic and universal any more than in the notions of the individual man. No age is historic, in and by itself. Like the individual, it only contributes its portion of investigation and opinion, to the sum total of material which is to undergo the test, not of an age, but of the ages.

Considerations like these go to show, that there is in that which is properly historic, nothing partial, nothing defective, nothing one-sided. It is the individual which has these characteristics; and only in proportion as the individual man becomes historic in his views, opinions and impressions; only as his culture takes on this large and catholic spirit, does he become truly educated. It is the sentiment of mankind at large, it is the opinion of the race, which is to be accepted as truth. This is furnished by history. When, therefore, the mind of the student, in the course of its education, is subjected to the full and legitimate influence of historical studies, it is subjected to a rectifying influence. The individual eye is purged, so that it sees through a crystalline medium. That darkening, distorting matter, composing oftentimes the idiosyncrasy rather than the individuality of the intellect, is drained off.

Having thus briefly discussed the nature of the historic spirit by a reference to the abstract nature of history, let us now seek to obtain a more concrete and lively knowledge of it, by looking at some of its actual influences upon the student. Let us specify some of the characteristics of the historic mind.

1. In the first place, the historic mind is both reverent and vigilant.

The study of history raises the intellect to a loftier eminence than that occupied by the student of the present; the man of the time. The vision of the latter is limited by his own narrow horizon, while that of the former goes round the globe. As a consequence, the historic mind is impressed with the vastness of truth. It knows that it is too vast to be all known by a single mind, or a single age; too immense to be taken in at a single glance; much less to be stated in a single proposition. Historical studies have, moreover, made it aware of the fact that truth is modified by passing through a variety of minds; that each form taken by itself is imperfect, and that, in some instances at least, all forms put together do not constitute a perfect manifestation of the "daughter of time." The posture and bearing of such a mind, therefore, towards all truth, be it human or divine, is at once reverent and vigilant. It is seriously impressed by the immensity of the field of knowledge, and at the same time is adventurous and enterprising in ranging over it. For it was when the human imagination was most impressed by the vastness of the globe, that the spirit of enterprise and adventure was most rife and successful. Before the minds of Columbus and De Gama, before the imagination of the Northmen and the early English navigators, space stretched away westward and southward like the spaces of astronomy, and was invested with the awfulness and grandeur of the spaces of the Miltonic Pandaemonium. Yet this sense of space, this mysterious consciousness of a vaster world, was the very stimulation of the navigator; the direct cause of all modern geographical discovery.

The merely individual mind, on the contrary, seeing but one form of truth, or, at most, but one form at a time, is apt to take this meagre exhibition for the full reality, and to suppose that it has reached the summit of knowledge. It is self-satisfied and therefore irreverent. It is disposed to rest in present acquisitions and therefore is neither vigilant nor enterprising.

2. And this naturally suggests the second characteristic of the historic mind: its productiveness and originality.

Such a mind is open to truth. The first condition to the advancement of learning is fulfilled by it; for it is the fine remark of Bacon, that the kingdom of science, like the kingdom of heaven, is open only to the child; only to the reverent, recipient

and docile understanding. Perhaps nothing contributes more to hinder the progress of truth than self-satisfied ignorance of what the human mind has already achieved. The age that isolates itself from the rest of the race and settles down upon itself, will accomplish but little towards the development of the race or of truth. The individual who neglects to make himself acquainted with the history of men and of opinions, though he may be an intense man within a very narrow circumference, will make no real advance and no new discoveries. Even the ardor and zealous energy, often exhibited by such a mind, and, we may say, characteristic of it, contribute rather to its growing ignorance, than its growing enlightenment. For it is the ardor of a mind exclusively occupied with its own peculiar notions. Its zeal is begotten by individual peculiarities, and expended upon them. Having no humble sense of its own limited ability, in comparison with the vastness of truth, or even in comparison with the power of the universal human mind, it closes itself against the great world of the past, and, as a penalty for this, hears but few of the deeper tones of the "many voiced present." In the midst of colors it is blind; in the midst of sounds it is deaf.

That mind, on the contrary, which is imbued with the enterprising spirit of history, contributes to the progress of truth and knowledge among men, by entering into the great process of inquiry and discovery which the race as such has begun and is carrying on. It moves onward with fellow-minds, in the line of a preceding advance, and consequently receives impulse from all the movement and momentum of the past. It joins on upon the truth which has actually been developed, and is thereby enabled to make a positive and valuable addition to the existing knowledge of the human race.

For the educated man, of all men, should see and constantly remember, that progress in the intellectual world, does not imply the discovery of truth absolutely new; of truth of which the human mind never had even an intimation before, and which came into it by a mortal leap, abrupt and startling, without antecedents and without premonitions. This would be rather of the nature of a Divine revelation than of a human discovery. A revelation from God is different in kind from a discovery of the human reason. It comes down from another sphere, from another mind, than that of man; and, although it is conformed to the wants of the human race, can by no means be regarded as a

natural development out of it; as a merely historical process, like the origination of a new form of government, or a new school of philosophy. A discovery of the human mind, on the contrary, is to be regarded as the pure, spontaneous, product of the human mind; as one fold in its unfolding.

It follows, consequently, that progress in human knowledge, progress in the development of human reason, does not imply the origination of truth absolutely and in all respects unknown before. The human mind has presentiments; dim intimations; which thicken all along the track of human history like the hazy belt of the galaxy among the clear, sparkling, mapped stars. These presentiments are a species and a grade of knowledge. They are not distinct and stated knowledge, it is true, but they are by no means blank ignorance. The nebulae are *visible*, though not yet resolved. Especially is this true in regard to the mind of the race; the general and historic mind. How often is the general mind restless and uneasy with the dim anticipation of the future discovery? This unrest, with its involved longing, and its potential knowledge, comes to its height, it is true, in the mind of some one individual who is most in possession of the spirit of his time, and who is selected by Providence as the immediate instrument of the actual and stated discovery. But such an one is only the secondary cause of an effect, whose first cause lies lower down and more abroad. There were Reformers before the Reformation. Luther articulated himself upon a process that had already begun in the Christian church, and ministered to a want, and a very intelligent want too, that was already in existence. Columbus shared in the enterprising spirit of his time, and differed in degree, and not in kind, from the bold navigators among whom he was born and bred. That vision of the new world from the shores of old Spain; that presentiment of the existence of another continent beyond the deep; a presentiment so strong as almost to justify the poetic extravagance of Schiller's sonnet, in which he says, that the boding mind of the mariner would have *created* a continent, if there had been none in the trackless West to meet his anticipation; that prophetic sentiment, Columbus possessed, not as an isolated individual, but as a man who had grown up with his age and into his age; whose teeming mind had been informed by the traditions of history, and whose active imagination had been fired by the strange narratives of anterior and contemporaneous navigation.

Another proof of the position that the individual mind owes much of its inventiveness and originality to its ability to join on upon the invention and origination already in existence, is found in the fact, that some of the most marked discoveries in science have occurred simultaneously to different minds. The dispute between the adherents of Newton and Leibnitz respecting priority of discovery in the science of Fluxions, is hardly yet settled; but the candid mind on either side will acknowledge that, be the mere matter of priority of detailed discovery and publication as it may, neither of these great minds was a servile plagiarist. The Englishman, in regard to the German, thought alone and by himself; and the German, in regard to the Englishman, thought alone and by himself. But both thought in the light of past discoveries, and of all then existing mathematical knowledge. Both were under the laws and impulse of the general scientific mind, as that mind had manifested itself historically in preceding discoveries, and was now using them *both* as its organ of investigation and medium of distinct announced discovery. The dispute between the English and French chemists, respecting the comparative merits of Black and Lavoisier, is still kept up; but here, too, candor must acknowledge that both were original investigators, and that an earlier death of either would not have prevented the discovery.

Now in both of these instances the minds of individuals had been set upon the trail of the new discovery by history; by a knowledge of the then present state and wants of science. They had kept up with the history of science; they knew what had actually been achieved; they saw what was still needed. They felt the wants of science, and these felt wants were dim anticipations of the supply, and finally led to it. It was because Newton and Leibnitz both labored in a historical line of direction, that they labored in the same line, and came to the same result, each of and by himself. For this historical basis for inquiry and discovery is common to all. And as there is but one truth to be discovered, and but one high and royal road to it, it is not surprising that often several minds should reach the goal simultaneously.

A striking instance of the productive power imparted to the individual mind by its taking the central position of history, is seen in the department of philosophy. In this department it is simply impossible, for the individual thinker to make any ad-

vance unless he first make himself acquainted with what the human mind has already accomplished in this sphere of investigation. Without some adequate knowledge of the course which philosophic thought has already taken, the individual inquirer in this oceanic region is all afloat. He does not even know where to begin, because he knows not where others have left off; and the system of such a philosopher, if it contain truth, is most commonly but the dry repetition of some previous system. Originality and true progress here, as elsewhere, are impossible without history. Only when the individual has made his mind historic by working his way into that great main current of philosophic thought, which may be traced from Pythagoras to Plato and Aristotle, from Aristotle to the Schoolmen, and from the Schoolmen to Kant, and moving onward with it up to the point where the next stage of true progress and normal development is to join on; only when he has thus found the proper point of departure in the present state of the science, is he prepared to depart, and to move forward on the straight but limitless line of philosophic inquiry. It is for this reason that the speculative systems of Germany exhibit such productiveness and originality. Whatever opinion may be held respecting the correctness of the Germanic mind in this department, no one can deny its fertility. The Teutonic philosopher first prepares for the appearance of his system, by a history of philosophy in the past, and then aims to make his own system the crown and completion of the entire historic process; the last link of the long chain. It is true that, in every instance thus far in the movement of this philosophy, the intended last link has only served as the support of another and still other links, yet only in this way of historic preparation could such a productive method of philosophizing have been attained. Only from the position of history, even though it be falsely conceived, can the speculative reason construct new and original systems.

A good illustration of the defectiveness which must attach to a system of philosophy, when it is not conceived and constructed in the light of the history of philosophy, is seen in the so-called Scotch school. A candid mind must admit that the spirit and general aim of this system was sound and correct. It was a reaction against the sensual school, especially as that system had been run out to its logical extreme in France. It recognized and made much of first truths, and that faculty of the mind which

the ablest teacher of this school loosely denominated Common Sense, and still more loosely defined, was unquestionably meant to be a power higher than that which "judges according to sense." But it was not an original system, in the sense of grasping with a stronger and more *scientific* grasp than had ever been done before, upon the standing problems of philosophy. It is true that it addressed itself to the solution of the old problems, in the main, in the right spirit and from a deep interest in the truth, but it did not go low enough down, and did not get near enough to the heart of the difficulty, to constitute it an original and powerful system of speculation. Its great defect is the lack of a *scientific* spirit, which is indicated in the fact that, although it has exerted a wide influence upon the popular mind, it has exerted but little influence upon the philosophic mind, either of Great Britain or the Continent.

And this defect is to be traced chiefly to the lack of an extensive and profound knowledge of the history of philosophic speculation. The individual mind, in this instance, attempted a refutation of the acute arguments of scepticism, without much knowledge of the previous developments of the sceptical understanding and the counter-statements of true philosophy. A comprehensive and reproductively study of the ancient Grecian philosophies, together with the more elaborate and profound of the modern systems, would have been a preparatory discipline for the Scottish reason that would have armed it with a far more scientific and original power. Its aim, in the first place, would have been higher, because its sense of the difficulty to be overcome would have been far more just and adequate. With more knowledge of what the human intellect had already accomplished, both on the side of truth and of error, its reflection would have been more profound; its point of view more central; its distinctions and definitions more philosophical and scientific; and its refutations more conclusive and unanswerable.¹

¹ This deficiency in scientific character, in the Scotch philosophy, is felt by its present and ablest defender, Sir William Hamilton. Far more deeply imbued himself with the spirit of the department than either Reid or Stewart was, because of a much wider and more thorough scholarship than either of them possessed, he has been laboring to give it what it lacks. But it is more than doubtful whether any mind that denies the possibility of metaphysics as distinguished from psychology, will be able to do much towards imparting a *necessary* and *scientific* character either to philosophy generally, or to a system which is popular rather than philosophic, in its foundations and superstructure.

Thus we might examine all the departments of human knowledge, singly by themselves, and we should find that, in regard to each of them, the individual mind is made at once recipient and original by the preparatory discipline of historical studies and the possession of the historic spirit. Even in the domain of Literature and Fine Art, the mind that keeps up with the progress of the nation or the race; the mind that is able to go along with the great process of national or human development in this department; is the original and originaunt mind. Although in Poetry and Fine Art, freshness and originality seem to depend more upon the impulse of individual genius and less upon the general movement of the national or the universal mind, yet here, too, it is a fact, that the founders of particular schools; we mean schools of eminent and historic merit; have been men of extensive study, and liberal, universal sympathies. The great masters of the several schools of Italian Art, were diligent students of the Antique, and had minds open to truth and nature in all the schools that preceded them. They, moreover, cherished a historic feeling and spirit, by a most intimate and general intercourse with each other. The generous rivalry that prevailed, sprung up from a close and genial study of each other's productions. The view which Celleni presents us of the relations of the Italian artists to each other, and of the general spirit that prevailed among them, shows that there was very little that was bigoted and individual in those minds so remarkable for originality and productiveness.

A very fine and instructive illustration of the truth we are endeavoring to establish, is found in the department of Literature in the poet Wordsworth. This man was a *student*. He cultivated the poetic faculty within him as sedulously as Newton cultivated the scientific genius within him. He retired up into the mountains, when he had once determined to make poetry the aim of his literary life, and by the thoughtful perusal of the English poets, as much as by his brooding contemplation of external nature, enlarged and strengthened his poetic power. By familiarizing himself with the spirit and principle; the *inward history*, of English poetry, he became largely imbued with the national spirit. And he was thorough in this course of study. He not only devoted himself to the works of the first English poets, the Chaucers, Spensers, Skakspeares and Miltons; but he patiently studied the productions of the second class, so much

neglected by Englishmen, the Draytons, the Daniels, and the Donnes. The works of these latter are not distinguished for passion in sentiment or beauty in form, but they are remarkable for that thoroughly English property, thoughtful sterling sense. Wordsworth was undoubtedly attracted to these poets, not merely because he believed, with that most philosophic of English critics who was his friend and contemporary, that good sense is the body of poetry, but because he saw that an acquaintance with them was necessary to a thorough knowledge of English poetry considered as a historic process of development, as one phase of the English mind. For, although a poem like the *Polyolbion* of Drayton can by no means be put into the first class with the *Faery Queen* of Spenser, it yet contains far more of the English temper and exhibits far more of the flesh and muscle of the native mind. These critics Wordsworth had patiently studied, as is indicated by that vein of strong sense which runs like a muscular cord through the more light and airy texture of his musings. It was because of this historical training as a poet, that Wordsworth's poetry breathes a far loftier and ampler spirit than it would have done had it been like that of Byron, for example, the product of an intense, but ignorant and narrow, individualism. And it was also because of this training, that Wordsworth, while preserving as original an individuality, certainly, as any poet of his time, acquired a much more national and universal poetic spirit than any other poet of his time, and was the most productive poet of his time.

The result, then, of the discussion of the subject under this head is, that the individual mind acquires power of discernment and power of statement only by entering into a process already going on; into the great main movement of the common human mind. In no way can the educated man become genially recipient, and at the same time richly productive, but by a profound study of the development which truth has already attained in the history of man and the world.

3. The third characteristic of the historic mind is its union of moderation and enthusiasm.

One of the most distinct and impressive teachings of history is, that not every opinion which springs up and has currency in a particular age, is true for all time. History records the rise and great popularity, for a while, of many a theory which succeeding ages have consigned to oblivion, and which has exerted no per-

manent influence upon human progress. There always are, among the opinions and theories prevalent in any particular period, some, and perhaps many, that have not truth enough in them to preserve them. And yet these may be the very ones that seize upon the individual and local mind with most violence and most immediate effect. Because they are partial and narrow, they for this reason grasp the popular mind more fiercely and violently. Were they broader and more universal in their character, their immediate influence might be less visible, because it would extend over a far wider surface, and go down to a much lower depth. A blow upon a single point makes a deep dint, but displaces very few particles of matter, while a steady heavy pressure over the whole surface, changes the position of every atom, with but little superficial change.

The proper posture, therefore, of the individual mind, and, especially, of the educated mind, towards the current opinions of the age in which he lives, is, that of moderation. The educated man should keep his mind equable, and, in some degree, aloof from passing views and theories. He ought not to allow theories that have just come into existence to seize upon his understanding with all that assault and onset with which they take captive the uneducated, and, especially, the unhistoric mind. Of what use are the teachings of history if they do not serve to render the mind prudently distrustful in regard to new-born opinions, at the same time that they throw it wide open and fill it with a strong confidence towards all that has historically *proved* itself to be true? Is it for the cultivated man, the man of broad and general views, to throw himself without reserve and with all his weight, into what, for aught he yet knows, may be only a cross-current and eddy, instead of the main stream of truth?

Now it is only by the possession of a historic spirit that the individual can keep himself sufficiently above the course of things about him, to enable him to judge correctly concerning them. Knowing what the human mind has already accomplished in a particular direction, in art or science, in philosophy or religion, he very soon sees whether the particular movement of the time in any one of these directions, will or will not coincide with the preceding movement and be concurrent with it. He occupies a height, a vantage ground, by virtue of his extensive historical knowledge, and he stands upon it, not with the tremor and fervor of a partisan, but with the calmness and insight of a judge.

Suppose the activity of an age, or of an individual, manifests itself in the production of a new theory in religion; of some new statement of Christian doctrine; the mind that is well versed in the history of the Christian church, and of Christian doctrine, will very quickly see whether the new joins on upon the old; whether it is an advance in the line of progress or a deviation from it. And his attitude will be accordingly. He will not be led astray with the multitude or even with the age. Through all the fervor and zeal of the period, he will preserve a moderate and temperate tone of mind; committing himself to current opinions no faster than he sees they will amalgamate with the truth which the human mind has already and confessedly discovered in past ages; with historic truth.

This moderation in adopting and maintaining current opinions is an infallible characteristic of a true scholar, of a ripe culture. And it is the fruit of that criticism and scepticism which is generated by historical study. For it is one of the effects of history to render the mind critical and sceptical; not, indeed, in respect to truth that has stood the test of time, but to truth that has just made its appearance. It would be untrue to say that the study of history genders absolute doubt and unbelief in the mind; that it tends generally and by its very nature to unsettle faith in the good and the true. This would be the case if there were no truth in history; if history were substantially the record of dissension and disagreement; if, above the din and uproar of discordant voices, one clear and clarion-like voice did not make itself heard as the voice of universal history. We are all familiar with the story told of Raleigh, who is said to have destroyed the unpublished half of his history, because of several persons who professed to describe an occurrence in the Tower Court, which he had also witnessed from his prison window; each gave a different version of it, and his own differed from theirs. But history is not thus uncertain and unreliable. It teaches but one lesson. It reveals but one truth. Down through the ages and generations it traces one straight line, and in this one line of direction lies truth, and out of it lies error. Its record of the successes and triumphs of truth certainly teaches a correct lesson, and its record of the successes and triumphs of error is but the dark background from which truth stands out in still more bold and impressive reality. Whatever may be the case with particular histories by particular individuals, the main current of his-

tory runs in one direction, and the great lesson of history is in favor of truth and righteousness.

Not, then, towards well-tried and well-established truth, but towards apparent and newly-discovered truth, does history engender criticism and scepticism. "The past is secure. That which has verified itself by the lapse of time, and the course of experiment, and the sifting of investigation, is commended as absolute and universal truth to the individual mind, and history bids it to believe and doubt not. But that which is current merely; that which in the novelty and youth of its existence is carrying all men away, must stand trial; must be brought to test, as all its predecessors have been. Towards the opinions and theories of the present, so far as they differ from those of the past, history is inquisitive, and critical, and sceptical, not for the purpose, be it remembered, of proving them to be false, but with the generous hope of evincing them to be true. For the scepticism of history is very different from scepticism in religion. The latter is always in some way biassed and interested. It springs out of a desire, conscious or unconscious, to overthrow that which the general mind has found to be true, and is resting in as truth. Scepticism in religion has always been in the minority; at war with the received opinions of the race, and consequently with all that is historic. There never was an individual sceptic, from Pyrrho to Strauss, who was not unhistoric; who did not take his stand outside of the great travelled road of human opinion; who did not try to disturb the human race in the possession of opinions that had come down from the beginning, besides having all the instincts of reason to corroborate them. But the scepticism of history has no desire to overthrow any opinion that has verified itself in the course of ages, and been organically assimilated, in the course of human development. All such opinion and all such truth constitutes the very substance of history itself; its very vitality and charm for the human mind; and, therefore, can never be the object of doubt or attack for genuine historic scepticism. On the contrary, the sifting and critical methods of history have no other end or aim but to make a real addition to the existing stock of well-ascertained truth, and to prevent any erroneous opinion or theory from going into this sum-total, and thus receiving the stamp and endorsement of history. This criticism and scepticism which history employs is simply for self-protection. These sceptical and sifting processes are gone through with, to

preserve history pure from the individual, the local, and the temporary, and to keep it universal and absolute in its contents and spirit.

Now it might seem at first glance, that this moderation of mind towards current opinions would preclude all earnestness and enthusiasm in the educated man; that the historic spirit must necessarily be cold and phlegmatic. It might seem that it would be impossible for such a mind to take an active and vigorous interest in the age in which it lived, and that it would be out of its element amid the stir and motion going on all around it. This is substantially the objection which the half-educated disciple of the present brings against history and historical views and opinions.

But this is a view that is false from defect; from not containing the *whole* truth. It arises from not taking the full idea of history into the mind. This idea, like all strictly so-called ideas, contains two opposites, which, to the superficial glance, look like irreconcilable contraries, but to a deeper and more adequate intuition, are not only perfectly reconcilable, but are opposites in whose conciliation consists the vitality and fertility of the idea, and of the science founded upon it. History, as we have seen, is both continuous and complete; and continuity and completeness are opposite conceptions. It is, in the first place, the record of a development that must uninterruptedly go on, and cannot cease, until the final consummation. And it is, in the second place, complete in its spirit, because at every point in the continuous process there are indications of the consummation; tendencies to an ultimate end. No part of history is irrelative. Even when it is but the history of a particular period, a small section of the great historic process, it exhibits this complete and universal spirit by clinging to what precedes and pointing to what succeeds; by its large discourse of reason looking before and after. But the objector does not reconcile these opposites in his own mind; he does not take this comprehensive and full view of history. Whether he acknowledges it or not, his view really is, that the many several ages of which history takes cognizance, have no inward connection with each other, nor any common tendency, and consequently that the whole entire past, in relation to the present, is a nonentity. It is gone, with all that it was and did, into "the dark backward and abysm" of time, and the present age, like every other, starts independent and

alone upon its particular mission. His view of history is atomic. On his theory, there is no such thing as either connected evolution or explanatory termination, in the course of the world. There is no human race, no common humanity, to be manifested in the millions of individuals, and the multitudes of ages and epochs. On this theory, there is and can be nothing in the past, in which the present has any *vital* interest; nothing in the past which has any *authority* for the present; nothing in the past which constitutes the root of the present, and nothing in the present which constitutes the germ of the future. History, on this theory, has no principle; no organization. It is a mere catalogue of events; a mere list of occurrences.

It is because the imperfectly educated disciple of the present, really takes this view of history, that he asserts that historic views and opinions are deadening in their influence upon the mind, and that the historic spirit is a lifeless spirit. If he believed in a living concatenation of events and a vital propagation of influences in history, he would not say that that which is truly historical, is virtually dead and buried. If he believed that no one age, any more than any one individual, contains the whole of human development within itself, but is only one fold of the great unfolding, he would suspect, at least, that there might be elements in the past so assimilated and wrought into the history of universal man that they are matters of living interest for every present age. If he believed that truth is reached only by the successive and consentaneous endeavors of many individual minds, each making use of all the labors of its predecessors, and each taking up the standing problem where its predecessors had dropped it; if the too zealous disciple of the present believed that truth is thus reached only by the efforts of the race; of the universal mind in distinction from the individual; he would find life all along the line of human history; he would see that in taking into his mind a historic view or opinion he was lodging there the highest intensity of mental life; the very purest and densest reason of the race.

Instead, therefore, of being cold, phlegmatical and lifeless, the historic mind is really the only truly living and enthusiastic mind. It is the only mind that is in communication. It is the only mind that is not isolated. And in the world of mind, intercommunication is not more necessary to a vital process, and isolation or breaking off is not more destructive of a vital process,

than in the world of nature. That zeal, begotten by the narrow views of an individual, or a locality, or an age, which the unhistoric mind exhibits, is an altogether different thing from the enthusiasm of a spirit enlarged, educated and liberalized by an acquaintance with all ages and opinions. Enthusiasm springs out of the contemplation of a whole; zeal from the examination of a part. And there is no surer test and sign of intellectual vitality than enthusiasm; that deep and sustained interest which is grounded in the broad views and profound intuitions of history.

But while the well-read student of history preserves a wise and cautious moderation, in the outset, towards current opinions, yet, because of this genial and enthusiastic interest in the truth which the human mind has actually and without dispute arrived at, he in the end comes to take all the interest in the views and theories of the present, which they really deserve. The historic mind does no ultimate injustice. So far and so fast as it finds that the new movement of the present age is a natural continuation of the unfinished development of the past, does he acknowledge it as a step in advance, and receives the new element into his mind and into his culture with all the enthusiasm and all the feeling with which he adopts the great historical systems of antiquity. In this way the historic mind is actually more truly alive and interested even in relation to the present, than the man of the present. It appreciates the real excellence of the time more intelligently and profoundly, and it certainly has a far more inspiring view of the connection of this excellence with the excellence that has preceded it, and which is the root of it. How much more inspiring and enlivening is that vision which sees the progress of the present linked to that of all the past, and contributing to make up that long line of development extending through the whole career of the human species, than that vision which sees but one thing at a time, and does not even know that it has any living references, or any organic connections whatever!

As an exemplification of the preceding remarks, contemplate for a moment the historian Niebulr. His was a genuinely historic mind. He conceived and constructed in the true spirit of history. He always viewed events in the light of the organization by which they were shaped and of which they were elementary parts. He saw by a native sagacity, in which respect he never had a superior, the idea lying at the bottom of a historical

process; such, for example, as the separate foundation of the city of Rome; the rise and formation of the Roman population; the growth and consolidation of the plebeians; and built up his account of it, out of it and upon it. His written history thus corresponds with a fresh and vital correspondence with the actual history; with the living process itself. In this way he reproduced history in his pages, and the student is carried along through the series with all the interest and charm of an actor in it. So sagacious was his intuition that, although two thousand years further off from them in time, he has unquestionably so reconstructed the very facts of the early history of Rome, as to bring them nearer the actual matter of fact, than they appear in the legendary pages of Livy. It was the habit of his mind, both by nature and by an acquisition as minute as it was vast, to look at human life as an indivisible unity, and to connect together all the ages, empires, civilizations and literatures, of the world by the bond of a common development; thus organizing the immense amount of material contained in human history into a complete and symmetrical whole.

But slow and sequacious as the movements of such an organizing and thoroughly historic mind were, and must be from the nature of the case, we do not hesitate to affirm that the mind of the historian Niebuhr was one of the most vividly alive and profoundly enthusiastic minds in all literary history. He was not spared to complete his great work as it lay in him to have done, and as he would have done, immense as it was, had he lived to the appointed age of man. He left it a fragment. He left it a Torso which no man can complete. But from that fragment has gushed, as from many living centres, all the life and power not only of Roman history, but of history generally, since his day. It gave an impulse to this whole department which it still continues to feel, besides reproducing itself in particular schools and particular individuals. It is the work which more than any other one production, shaped the opinions of the most vigorous and enthusiastic of English historians, the late Dr. Arnold. And that serious spirit which we find in history since the days of Niebuhr, when compared with the moral indifference characterizing the department before his day and to a great extent during his day, is to be traced to his reverent recognition of a personal Deity in history, and his deep belief in the freedom and accountability of man.

But the man himself, as well as his works, was full of life, and he showed it nowhere more plainly than in his direct address to the minds of his pupils. "When he spoke," says one of them, "it always appeared as if the rapidity with which the thoughts occurred to him, obstructed his power of communicating them in regular order or succession. Nearly all his sentences, therefore, were anacoluths; for, before having finished one, he began another, perpetually mixing up one thought with another, without producing any one in its complete form. This peculiarity was more particularly striking when he was laboring under any mental excitement, which occurred the oftener, as, with his great sensitiveness, he felt that warmth of interest in treating of the history of past ages, which we are accustomed to witness only in discussions on the political affairs of our own time and country." The writer, after speaking of the difficulty of following him, owing to this rapid, and, it should be added, entirely extemporaneous delivery (for he spoke without a scrap of paper before him), remarks, that "notwithstanding this deficiency in Niebuhr as a lecturer, there was an indescribable charm in the manner in which he treated his subject; the warmth of his feelings, the sympathy which he felt with the persons and things he was speaking of, his strong conviction of the truth of what he was saying, his earnestness, and, above all, the vividness with which he conceived and described the characters of the most prominent men, who were to him living realities, with souls, feelings and passions like ourselves, carried his hearers away, and produced effects which are usually the results only of the most powerful oratory."¹

How different from all this is the impression which we receive from the mind of one who, notwithstanding his great defects, must yet thus far be regarded as the first of English historians; from the mind of Gibbon. After a candid and full allowance of the ability of that mind and the great value of the *History of the Decline and Fall of Rome*, it must yet be said that it was not a vivid and vital mind, nor is its product. The autobiography of Gibbon, indeed, exhibits considerable native liveliness of mind, but the perusal of his history does not even suggest the existence of such qualities as earnestness and enthusiasm. One is disposed to conclude from the picture which he gives of himself, that the historian had been endowed by his Maker with a much more than average share of mental freshness and vitality, and

¹ Dr. Leonhard Schmitz. Preface to Vol. IV. of Niebuhr's *Rome*.

most certainly if there had been in exercise enough of this quality; enough of the *vis vivida vite*; to have vivified the immense, well-selected and well-arranged material of his history, he would have approximated nearer than he has to the ideal of historical composition. But there was not, and, therefore, it is, that, throughout the whole of this great work, there reigns, so far as the human and moral interest of history is concerned, so far as all the higher religious problems of history are concerned, an utter sluggishness, apathy and lifelessness; an apathy and lifelessness as deep, unvarying and monotonous as if the forces of the period he described, the principles of decline and decay, had passed over into his own understanding and made it the theatre of their operations. We doubt whether there is another work in any literature whatever, possessing so many substantial excellences, and yet characterized by such a total destitution of glowing inspiration and earnest enthusiasm, as the History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.

The explanation of this fact will corroborate the truth of the position, that the *genuinely* historic mind is the only truly living and enthusiastic mind. Though nominally a historian, Gibbon was really, utterly unhistoric in his spirit. His religious scepticism, besides paralyzing whatever natural vigor and earnestness of conception may have originally belonged to him, made it impossible for him to regard the processes of human history as so many parts of one grand plan of the world formed by one supreme and presiding mind. History for him, consequently, had no organization and no moral significance. It was, therefore, strictly speaking, no history at all for him; no course of development with a divine plan at the bottom of it and a divine purpose at the termination of it. It was neither continuous in its nature, nor complete in its spirit and tendency. Everything that occurred in the world at large, or among a particular people, was for his mind irreferent, discontinuous and sporadic. Not only did he fail to connect the History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire with the general history of the race, or even with the general history of Rome, by exhibiting it in its relation to its antecedents and consequents, but he failed even to detect the historic principle lying at the bottom of the particular period itself. The great *moral and political causes* of the decline and fall of the Roman empire, do not stand out in bold and striking relief from the immense erudition and imposing rhetoric of that

work. The reflecting reader of this history, at the close of the perusal, feels the need of something more than a scenic representation of the period; something more that the pomp of a panorama; in order to a knowledge of the deep *ground* of all this decline and decay. He needs in short, what Gibbon does not furnish, more of the philosophy of that history, drawn from a profounder view of the nature of man and of human life, united with a deeper insight into the radical defect in the political constitution of the Roman empire; into that germ of corruption which came into existence immediately after the subjugation of the Italian tribes was completed, and in which the entire millennium of decline and decay lay coiled up.

We have thus far discussed the nature of the historic spirit on general grounds. We have mentioned only those general characteristics which are matters of interest to every cultivated mind; having reference chiefly to secular history and general education. We have now to speak of the importance of this spirit to the theologian, and must, therefore, discuss its more special nature, with a prevailing reference to Ecclesiastical History and Theological Education.

Before proceeding to the treatment of this part of the subject, it seems necessary to direct attention, for a moment, to the distinguishing difference between Secular and Church history.

Our Lord, in the most distinct manner, and repeatedly, affirms that His kingdom is not of this world. Throughout the Scriptures the church and the world are opposed to each other as direct contraries, mutually exclusive and expulsive of each other, so that "all that is of the world is not of the Father, but is of the world." There are, therefore, two kingdoms, two courses of development, two histories, in the universal history of man on the globe. There is the account of the natural and spontaneous development of human nature as left to itself, guided only by the dictates of finite reason and impelled by the determination of the free, but fallen, human will, and the impulses of human passion. And there is the history of that supernatural and gracious development of human nature which has been begun and carried forward by means of a revelation from the Divine Mind made effectual by the direct efficiency of the Divine Spirit. The fact of sin, and the fact of redemption, constitute the substance of that great historic process which is involved in the origin, growth and final triumph of the Christian church. Had there been no

fall of man, there would have been but one stream of history. The spontaneous development of the human race would have been normal and perfect, and there would have been no such distinction between the church and the world as is recognized in Scripture. The race would not have been broken apart; one portion being left to a merely human and entirely false development, and the other portion being renovated and started upon a spiritual and heavenward career by the electing love of God. But sin in this, as in all its aspects, is dissension and dismemberment. The original unity of the race, *so far as a common religious character and a common blessed destiny are concerned*, is destroyed, and the two halves of one being, to borrow an illustration from the Platonic myth, are now and forever separated. The original single stream of human history was parted in the garden of Eden, and became into two heads, which have flowed on, each in its own channel, and will continue to do so, forevermore. For, although the church is to encroach upon the world in the future, to an extent far surpassing anything that appears in its present and past history, we know, from the very best authority, that sin is to be an eternal fact in the universe of God, and as such must have its own awful and isolated development; its own awful and isolated history.

In passing, therefore, from secular to church history, we pass from the domain of merely human and sinful, to that of truly divine and holy, agencies. The subject-matter becomes extraordinary. The basis of fact in the history of the church is supernatural in both senses of the word. From the expulsion from Eden down to the close of miracles in the apostolic age, a positively miraculous intervention of Divine power lies under the series of events; momentarily withdrawn and momentarily re-appearing, throughout the long line of Patriarchal, Jewish and Apostolic history; the very intermittency of the action indicating, like an Icelandic Geyser, the reality and constant proximity of the power. And if we pass from external events to that inward change that was constantly brought about in human character by which the church was called out from the mass of men and made to live and grow in the midst of an ignorant or a cultivated heathenism; if we pass from the miraculous to the simply spiritual manifestation of the Divine agency as it is seen in the inward history of the church, we find that we are in a far different and a far higher sphere than that of secular history.

There is now a positive intercommunication between the human and the Divine mind, and the development which results constitutes a history far profounder, far purer and holier, far more encouraging and glorious, than the history of the natural man and the secular world.

It is upon the fact of this direct and supernatural communication of the Supreme mind to the human mind, and this direct agency of the Divine Spirit upon the human soul, that we would take our stand as the point of departure in the remainder of this discussion. In treating of secular history, we have regarded the unaided reason of man as the source and origin of the development. We do not find in the history of the world, as the Scriptural antithesis of the church, any evidence of any special and direct intercommunication between man and God. We find only the ordinary workings of the human mind and such products as are confessedly within its competence to originate. We can, indeed, see the hand of an overruling Providence throughout secular history, employed chiefly in restraining the wrath of man, but through the whole long course of development we see no signs or products of a supernatural and peculiar interference of God in the affairs of men. Empires rise and fall; arts and sciences bloom and decay; the poet dreams his dream of the ideal, and the philosopher develops and tasks the utmost possibility of the finite reason; and still, so far as its highest interests are concerned, the condition and history of the race remains substantially the same. It is not until a communication is established between the mind of man and the mind of God; it is not until the Creator comes down by miracle and by revelation, by incarnation and by the Holy Ghost, that a new order of ages and new species of history begins.

The Scriptures, therefore, as the revelation of the Eternal Mind, take the place of human reason within the sphere of church history. The individual man sustains the same relation to the Bible, in the sacred historic process, that he does to natural reason in the secular. The theologian expects to find in the history of the church that same comprehensive and approximately exhaustive development and realization of Scripture truth, which the philosopher hopes to find of the finite reason in the secular history of the race. It follows, consequently, that all that has been said of the influence of historical studies upon the literary man, applies with full force; when the distinguishing difference

between secular and sacred history has been taken into account, to the education and culture of the theologian. The same spirit will work the same results in both departments of knowledge, and the theologian, like the literary man, will become, in his own intellectual domain, both reverent and vigilant; both recipient and original; both deliberate and enthusiastic; as his mind feels the influences that come off from the history of the Christian religion and the Christian church.

Without, therefore, going again over the ground which we have travelled in the first part of the discourse, let us leave the general influences and characteristics of the historic spirit, and proceed to consider some of the most important of its specific influences within the department of theology and upon theological education. And, that we may not be embarrassed by the attempt to make use of all the materials that crowd in upon the mind on all sides, and from all parts, of this encyclopaedic subject, let us leave altogether untouched the external history of the church, and keep chiefly in view that most interesting and important branch of the department which is denominated Doctrinal Church History.

I. In the first place, a historic spirit within the department of theology promotes Scripturality.

We have already mentioned that the distinctive character of church history arises from the special presence and agency of the Divine Mind in the world. Subtract that presence and that agency, and nothing is left but the spontaneous development of the natural man; nothing is left but secular history. Divine revelation, using the term in its widest signification, to denote the entire communication of God to man in the economy of grace, is the principle and germ of church history. That shaping of human events, and that formation and moulding of human character, which has resulted from the covenant of redemption, is the substance of sacred history. The church is the concrete and realized plan of redemption; and what is the plan of redemption but the sum-total of revelations which have been made to man by the Jehovah of the Old Testament and the Incarnate Word of the New, the infallible record of which is unchangeably fixed in the Scriptures? It follows, therefore, that the true and full history of the church of God on earth will be the Scriptures in the concrete. The plant is only the unfolded germ.

There is, consequently, no surer way to fill systematic theology

with a Scriptural substance than to subject it to the influence of historical studies. As the theologian passes the several ages of the church in review, and becomes acquainted with the results to which the general mind of the church has come in interpreting the Scriptures, he runs little hazard of error in regard to their real teaching and contents. As in the domain of secular history we found that there was little danger of missing the true teachings of human reason, if we collect them from the continuous and self-defecating development of ages and epochs, so in the domain of sacred history we shall find that the real mind of the Spirit; the real teaching of Scripture, comes out plainer and clearer in the general growth and development of the Christian mind. Indeed, we may regard church history, so far as it is mental and inward in its nature; so far as it is the record of a mental inquiry into the nature of Christianity and the contents of the Bible, as being as near to the infallibility of the written revelation, as anything that is still imperfect and fallible can be. The church is not infallible and never can be; but it is certainly not a very bold or dangerous affirmation to say that the church; the entire body of Christ, is wiser than any one of its members, and that the whole series of ages and generations of believers have penetrated more deeply into the substance of the Christian religion and have come nearer to an approximate exhaustion of Scripture truth, than any single age or single believer has.

So far, therefore, as a theological system contains historical elements, it is likely to contain Scriptural elements. So far as its statements of doctrine coincide with those of the creeds and symbols in which the wise, the learned and the holy of all ages have embodied the results of their continuous and self-correcting study of the Scriptures, so far it may be expected to coincide with the substance of inspiration itself.

Again, there is no surer way to imbue the theologian himself with a Scriptural spirit than to subject his mind to the full influence of a course of study in the history of the Christian religion and church. This is one of the best means which the individual mind can employ to reach the true end of a theological education; which is to get within the circle of inspired minds and see the truth exactly as they saw it. We believe, as the church has always believed, that the inspired writers were qualified and authorized to speak upon the subject of religion as no other human minds have been. They were the subjects of an illumi-

nation clearer and brighter than that of the purest Christian experience; and of a revelation that put them in possession of truths that are absolutely beyond the ken of the wisest human mind. Within that inspired circle, therefore, there was a body of knowledge intrinsically inaccessible to the human mind; beyond the reach of its subtlest investigation, or its purest self-development. If those supernaturally taught minds had been prevented from fixing their knowledge in a written form; or if the written revelation had perished like the lost books of Livy; the human mind of the nineteenth century would have known no more upon moral and religious subjects, for substance, than the human mind of a Plato or Aristotle knew twenty-two centuries ago. For he must have an extravagant estimate of the inherent capacities of the finite mind, who supposes that the rolling round of two millenniums, or of ten, would have witnessed in any one individual case, a more central, or a more defecated, development of the pure rationality of mere man than was witnessed in Aristotle. And he must have a very ardent belief in the omnipotence of the finite, who supposes, that, without that communication of truth and of spirit; of light and of life; which God in Christ has made to the race, ages upon ages of merely spontaneous and secular history would have produced a more beautiful development of the human imagination than appears in the Grecian Art and Literature, or a more profound development of the human reason than appears in the Grecian Philosophy and the Grecian Ethics.

The Scriptures have, accordingly, been the source of religious knowledge and progress for the Christian, as antithetic to the secular, mind, and will continue to be, until they are superseded by some other and fuller revelation in another mode of being than that of earth. It has, consequently, been the aim and endeavor of the church in all ages, to be Scriptural; to work itself into the very heart of the written revelation; to stand upon the very same point of view with the few inspired minds, and see objects precisely as they saw them. But this, though possible and a duty, is no easy task, as the whole history of Christian doctrines shows. Truth in the Scriptures is full and entire. The Scriptural idea is never defective, but contains all the elements. Hence its very perfection and completeness is an obstacle to its full apprehension. It is difficult for the human mind to take in the *whole* great thought. It is often exceedingly difficult

for the human mind oppressed, first, by the vastness and mystery of the revealed truth, and, secondly, by its own singular tendency to one-sided and imperfect perception, to gather the full idea from the artless and unsystematized contents of Scripture, and then state it in the imperfect language of man. The doctrine of the Trinity, for example, is fully revealed in the Bible. *All* the elements of that great mystery; the whole truth respecting the real triune nature of God, may be found in that book. But the elements are uncombined and unexpanded, and hence one source of the heresies respecting this doctrine. Arius and Sabellius both appealed to Scripture. Neither of them took the position of the infidel. Each acknowledged the authority of the written word, and endeavored to support his position from it. But in these instances the individual mind merely picked up Scriptural elements as they lie scattered upon the page and in the letter of Scripture, and, without combining them with others that lie just as plainly upon the very same pages, moulded them into a defective, and therefore erroneous, statement. Heresy is individual and not historic in its nature.

Now it is the characteristic of the general mind of the church; of the historic Christian mind; that it reproduces in its intuition, and in its statement, the *complex* and *complete* Scriptural idea. So far as it has any intuition at all, it sees *all* the sides; so far as it makes any statement at all, it brings into it *all* the fundamentals. By this is not meant that even the mind of the church has perfected the expansion of Scripture elements and made the fullest possible statement of the doctrine of the Trinity. There may, possibly, be a further exhaustion of the contents of revelation in this direction. There may, possibly, be a statement of this doctrine that will be yet fuller; still closer up to the Scriptural matter; than that one which the church has generally accepted since the date of the Councils of Nice and Constantinople. But there will never be a form of statement that will flatly contradict this form, or that will add any new fundamentals to it. All that is new and different must be in the way of expansion and not of addition; in the way of development and not of denial. A closer study of the teachings of Scripture, and a deeper reflection upon them, may carry the theological mind further along on the line, but will give it no diagonal or retrograde movement.

Now is it not perfectly plain that the close and thorough study

of this continuous and self-correcting endeavor of the Christian church to enucleate the real meaning of Scripture; an endeavor which has been put forth by the wisest, the most reverent, and the holiest, minds in its history, tasking their own powers to the utmost, and invoking and receiving Divine illumination, during the whole of the process; an endeavor which has to a great extent formed and fixed the religious experience of ages and generations, by its results embodied in the creeds and symbols of the church; a series of mental constructions, which, even if we contemplate only their human characteristics, their scientific coherence and systematic compactness, are more than worthy to be placed side by side with the best dialectics of the secular mind; is it not perfectly plain, we say, that the close and thorough study of such a strenuous endeavor, as this has been, to reach the inmost heart and fibre of Scripture, will tend irresistibly to render the theologian Scriptural in head and in heart? May we not expect that such a student will be *intensely* Scriptural? Will not this distinct and thorough knowledge of revelation be so wrought into his mental texture that he will see and judge of everything through this medium? Will he not have so thought in that same range and region in which his inspired teachers thought, that doubt and perplexity in regard to Divine revelation would be nearly as impossible for him, as for that of Isaiah while under the Divine afflatus, or for Paul when in the third heavens? To borrow an illustration from the kindred science of Law: if it is the effect of the continued and thoughtful study of Law Reports and Political Constitutions and Commentaries upon Political Constitutions; a body of literature which, as it originates out of the organic idea of law, breathes the purest spirit of the legal reason; if it is the effect of such study to render the individual mind legal and judicial in its tone and temper, must it not be the effect of the study of that body of symbolic literature which has come slowly but consecutively into existence through the endeavor of the theological mind to reach a perfect understanding of Scripture, to render the individual mind Scriptural in its tone and temper?

II. And this leads us to say, in the second place, that a historic spirit in the theologian, induces a correct estimate of Creeds and Systematic Theology.

One of the most interesting features in the present condition of the theological world is a revived interest in the department

of church history. This interest has been slowly increasing for the last half century, and promises to become a leading interest for some time to come. In Germany, in America, and in England scholars and thinking men are turning their attention away, somewhat, from the purely secular history of mankind, to that more solemn and momentous career which a part of the human family have been running for nearly six thousand years. They have become aware that the history of the church of God is a peculiar movement that has been silently going on in the heart of the race from the beginning of time, and which, while it has not by any means left the secular historic processes untouched and unaffected, has yet kept on in its own solitary and sublime line of direction. They are now disposed to look and see how and where

* * the sacred river ran
Through caverns measureless to man
Down to the sunlit sea.

But it would be an error to suppose that this interest has been awakened merely or mainly by the external history of the Christian church. "The battles, sieges, fortunes it hath passed;" its conflicts with persecuting Paganism, Mohammedanism, and Romanism; its influence upon art, upon literature and science, upon society and government; these are not the charm which is now drawing as by a spell the best thinking of Christendom towards church history. It is not the secular and worldly elements in this history into which the mind of the time most desires to look. The great march of secular history brings to view a pomp and prodigality of such elements that has already dulled and satiated the tired sensibilities. Thinking minds now desire to look into the distinctively supernatural elements in this historic process; to see if it really has, as it claims to have, a direct connection with the Creator of the race and the Author of the human mind. It is for this reason that the revived interest in this department of knowledge has shown itself most powerfully and influentially in investigating the origin and nature of the *doctrines* of the church, as they are found speculatively in creeds and symbols, and practically in the Christian consciousness. The mind of Germany, for example, after ranging over the whole field of cultivated heathenism, and sounding the lowest depths of the finite reason, in a vain search for that absolute truth in which alone the human

soul can rest, has betaken itself to the domain of Christian revelation and Christian history. Its interest in Greek and Roman culture, in Mediaeval Art, and in its own speculative systems, has given way to a deeper interest in the Christian religion; in some instances with a clear perception, in others with a dim intimation, that, if the truth which the human mind needs, is not to be found here, the last resource has failed; and that then

The pillared firmament is rottenness
And earth's base built on stubble.

This revived interest in church history, therefore, is in reality a search after truth, rather than after a mere dramatic scene or spectacle. The mind of the time is anxious to understand that *revealed doctrinal system*, which it now sees, has, from the beginning, been the "rock" on which the church of God has been founded, and the "quarry" out of which it has been built. Knowing this, it believes it will then have the key to the history. Knowing this, it believes it will know the whole secret; the secret of that charmed life which has borne the church of God through all the mutations and extinctions of secular history, and of that unearthly life which in all ages has secured to the believer a serene or an ecstatic passage into the unknown and dreadful future.

Now this interest in a doctrinal system which thus lies at the bottom of this general interest in church history, will be shared by the individual student. He, too, cannot stop with the scene, the spectacle, the drama. He, too, cannot stop with those characteristics which ecclesiastical history has in common with secular, but will pass on to those which are distinctive and peculiar. For him, too, the history of a single mind, like that of Augustine or Anselm; or of a single doctrine, like that of the Atonement or of the Trinity; will have a charm and fruitfulness not to be found in the entire rise of the worldly Papacy, or in centuries of merely external and earthly movement like the Crusades. The whole influence of his studies in this direction will be spiritual and spiritualizing.

But, without enlarging upon the general nature of the estimate which the historic spirit puts upon the internal as compared with the external history of the church, let us notice two particulars which fall under this head.

1. Notice, first, the interest awakened by historical studies in the creeds and symbols of the Christian church *as containing the Philosophy of Christianity.*

We have spoken of the symbolic literature of the Christian church as a growth out of Scripture soil; as a fruitage full of the flavor and juices of its germ. A Christian creed is not the product of the individual or the general human mind evolving out of itself those truths of natural reason and natural religion which are connate and inborn. It is not the self-development of the human mind, but the development of Scripture matter. The Christian mind, as we have seen, is occupied, from age to age, with an endeavor to fathom the depths of Divine revelation; to make the fullest possible expression and expansion of all the truths that have been communicated from God to man. This endeavor necessarily assumes a scientific form. The practical explanation, illustration, and application, is going on continually in the popular representations of the pulpit and the sermon, but this cannot satisfy all the wants of the church. Simultaneously with this there is a constant effort to obtain a still more scientific apprehension of Scripture and make a still more full and self-consistent statement of its contents. The Christian mind, as well as the secular, is scientific; has a scientific feeling, and scientific wants. A creed is as necessary to a theologian, as a philosophical system is to the secular student.

It follows, therefore, that the philosophy, by which is meant the rationality, of the Christian religion, is to be found in these creeds and symbols. For reasonableness and self-consistence are qualities not to be carried into Christianity from without, as if they were not to be found in it, but are to be brought out from within, because they belong to its intrinsic nature. The philosophy, that is, the rational necessity, of the Christian religion, is not an importation but an evolution. This religion is to be taken just as it is given in the Scriptures; just as it reappears in the close and systematic statement of the creeds; and its intrinsic truth and reasonableness evinced by what it furnishes itself. For whoever shows the *inward* necessity and reasonableness of a doctrine of Christianity does by the very act and fact show the harmony of philosophy and religion. Whoever takes a doctrine of Christianity and without anxiously troubling himself with the tenets of this or that particular philosophical system, derives out of the very elements of the doctrine and the very terms of the

statement itself, a reasonableness that irresistibly commends itself to the spontaneous reason and instinctive judgment of universal man, by this very process demonstrates the *inward, central*, unity of faith and reason. Instead, therefore, of setting the two sciences over against each other and endeavoring, by modifications upon one or both sides, to bring about the adjustment, the theologian should take the Christian system precisely as it is given in Scripture, in all its comprehension, depth and strictness, and without being diverted by any side references to particular philosophical schools, simply exhibit the *intrinsic* truthfulness, rationality, and necessity of the system. In this way he establishes the position, that philosophy and revelation are harmonious, in a manner that admits of no contradiction. The greater necessarily includes the less. When the theologian has demonstrated the inward necessity of Christianity, out of its own self-sufficient and independent rationality, his demonstration is perfect. For reason cannot be contrary to reason. A rational necessity anywhere, is a philosophical necessity everywhere.

The correctness of this method of finding and establishing the rationality of Christianity, is beginning to be acknowledged in that country where the conflict between reason and revelation has been hottest. It begins to be seen that the harmony between philosophy and Christianity is not to be brought about, by first assuming that the infallibility is on the side of the human reason; and that, too, as it appears in a *single* and *particular* philosophical system; and then insisting that all the adjustment, conformity, and coalescence, shall be on the side of the Divine revelation. It begins to be seen that philosophy is in reality an abstract and universal term, which, by its very etymology, denotes, not that it has already attained and now possesses the truth, but that it is seeking for it.¹ It begins to be seen that both Aristotle and Bacon were right in calling it an *organon*; an *instrument* for getting at the truth, and neither the truth itself nor even its containing source.² It begins to be seen that philosophy is only another

¹ The love of wisdom, implies a present seeking for it.

² Kant, says William Humboldt, did not so much teach philosophy, as how to philosophize. Correspondence with Schiller: *Vorerinnerung*.

It is the greatest merit of Schleiermacher that he saw and asserted the independent and self-subsistent position of Christian theology in relation to philosophical systems. If he had sought the sources of this theology more in the objective revelation and less in the subjective Christian consciousness, he would have

term for rationality, and that to exhibit the philosophy of a department, like religion, or history, or philosophy, or natural science, is simply to exhibit the real and reasonable truth that is in it. It begins to be seen, consequently, that each branch of knowledge, each subject of investigation, must be treated *genetically* in order to be treated philosophically; must be allowed to furnish its own matter, make its own statements, out of which, and not out of what may be carried over into it from some other quarter, its acceptance or its rejection by the human mind should be determined.

We are aware that the barrenness of those later systems of speculative philosophy, with which the German mind has been so intensely busied for the last fifty years, has been one great means of bringing it back to this moderate and true estimate of the nature and functions of philosophy; but this revived interest in the history of Christianity and profounder study of its symbols, has also contributed, greatly, to produce this disposition to let revealed religion stand or fall upon its own merits. For this study has disclosed the fact that it has philosophical and scientific merits of its own; that, in the unsystematized statements and simple but prolific teachings of the Bible, there lies the substance of a *system* deeper and wider and loftier than the whole department of philosophy, and that this substance has actually been expanded and combined by the historic mind of the church into a series of doctrines respecting the nature of God and man and the universe with their mutual relations, with which the corresponding statements upon the same subjects, of the Greek Theism or the German Pantheism cannot compare for a moment. Probably nothing has done more to exhibit the Christian system in its true nature and proportions, and thereby to render it grand and venerable to the modern scientific mind, than this history of its origin and formation. As the scientific man studies the articles of a creed, which one of the most naturally scientific minds of the race, aided by the wisdom of predecessors and contemporaries, derived from the written revelation; as the rigorous and dialectic man follows Athanasius down into those depths of the Divine nature, which yawn like a gulf of darkness before the unaided human mind; if he finds nothing to love and adore, he

accomplished more than he has towards evincing the harmony of the two sciences, while his own system would have had more agreement than it now has with the general theology of the Christian church.

finds something to respect; if he finds no food for his affections, he finds some matter for his thoughts. Here, too, is science. Here, too, is the profound intuition expressed in the clear but inadequate conception; the most thorough unions, guarded against the slightest confusions; analysis and synthesis; opposite conceptions reconciled in their higher and original unities; in short, all the forms of science, filled up in this instance as in no other, with the truth of eternal necessary fact and eternal necessary being.

And this same kind of influence, only in much greater degree, is exerted by historical studies upon the mind of the theologian. As he becomes better acquainted with the history of Christian doctrines, he becomes more disposed to find his philosophy of human nature and of the Divine nature in them, rather than in human systems. As he studies the development of that great doctrine, the doctrine of sin, he becomes convinced, if he was not before, that the powers and capacities and possible destiny of the human soul have received their most profound examination within the sphere of Christian theology. As he studies the history of that other great doctrine, the doctrine of the atonement, he sees plainly that the ideas of law and justice and government, of guilt and punishment and expiation; ideas that are the life and lifeblood of the Aristotelian ethics, the best and purest ethical system which the human reason was able to construct; that these great parent ideas show truest, fullest, largest and clearest, by far, within the consciousness of the Christian mind.

What surer method, therefore, of making his mind *grow* into the philosophy of Christianity can the theologian employ, than the historic method? In what better way can he arm himself for the contest with ignorant or with cultivated scepticism, than by getting possession, through the reproductive study of dogmatic history, of the exact contents of Scripture as expanded and systematized by the consentaneous and connected studies of the Fathers, the Reformers, and the Divines, the Councils, the Synods and the Assemblies, of the Church universal?

2. Secondly, notice the interest awakened by historical studies in the creeds and symbols of the Christian church *as marks of development and progress in theology*.

If we have truly enunciated the idea of history, in the first part of this discourse, it follows that all *genuine* development is

a *historical* development, and all *true* progress is a *historical* progress. For the *true* history of anything is the account of its development according to its true idea and necessary law. The history of a natural object, like a crystal, for example, is the account of its rigorously geometric collection and upbuilding about a nucleus. Crystallization is a *necessary* process, for it is a petrified geometry. The history of a tree is the account of its spontaneous and *inevitable* evolution out of a germ. The process itself, in both of these instances, is predetermined and fixed. The account of the process, therefore, if it is exactly confined to the actual matter of fact, has a fixed, and predetermined character also. For, if nature herself goes forward in a straight and undeviating line, the history of nature must follow on after, and tread in her very and exactest footsteps. Hence, true legitimate history, of any kind, is neither arbitrary nor capricious. It corresponds to real fact, and real fact is the process of real nature. The matter and method of nature, therefore, dictate the matter and method of the history of nature.

And the same holds true, when we pass from history in the sphere of nature to history in the realm of mind and spirit. The matter and method of a spiritual idea dictate the matter and method of the unfolding, and, consequently, of the history, of that idea. In the case now under discussion, the real nature and inward structure of Christianity determine what does, and what does not, belong to its true historical development. The true history of Christianity, therefore, is the history of true Christianity. The church historian is, indeed, obliged to take into account the deviations from the true Scriptural idea, because, unlike the naturalist, he is within the sphere of freedom and of false development, and because redemption itself is a mixed process of dying to sin and living to righteousness. But he notices the deviations not for the purpose, it should be carefully observed, of letting them make up a part of the true and normal history of Scriptural Christianity. The church historian is obliged to watch the rise and growth of heresies, not surely because they constitute an integral part of the legitimate development and true history of Scripture truth. The account of a heresy has only a negative historical value. All the positive and genuine history of Christian doctrine is to be made up out of that correct apprehension and unfolding which Scripture has received from the Catholic as antithetic to the Heretical mind. Temporary depar-

tures from the real nature of Scripture, truth, and deductions from it that are illegitimate, may possibly have contributed to a return to a deeper and clearer knowledge of revelation on the part of some few minds, and have unquestionably elicited a more full and comprehensive statement and defence of Christianity on the part of others, and in this way the heresies that appear all along the line of church history, throw light upon the true course of doctrinal development and help to bring out the true history. But these heretical processes themselves, cannot be regarded as integrant and necessary parts of the great historic process, any more than the diseases of the human body can be regarded, equally with the healthy processes of growth, as the normal development of the organism. Nosology is not a chapter in physiology.

It follows, consequently, that the *true* and *proper* history of Christianity will exhibit a *true* and *proper* theological progress. It will show that the Scripture germ implanted by God, has been slowly but correctly unfolding in the doctrine and science of the church. We cannot grant that historical theology is anti-scriptural and radically wrong; that the Bible has had no true and legitimate apprehension in the ages and generations of believers. There has been, notwithstanding all the attacks of infidelity from without, and controversies from within, a substantial agreement, and a steady advance, in understanding the written revelation. This is very plainly to be seen in the history of doctrines, and from this we may draw the most forcible proofs and illustrations. Let any one compare the first with the latest Christian creed, and he will see the development which the Scripture mustard-seed has undergone. Let any one place the Apostles' creed beside that of the Westminster Assembly, and see what a vast expansion of revealed truth has taken place. The former was all that the mind of the church in that age of infancy was able to eliminate and systematize out of the Scriptures; and this simple statement was sufficient to satisfy the imperfectly developed scientific wants of the early church. The latter creed was what the mind of the church was able to construct out of the elements of the very same written revelation, after fifteen hundred years of study and reflection upon them. The "words," the doctrinal elements, of Scripture, are "spirit and life," and hence, like all spirit and all life, are capable of expansion. Upon them the historic Christian mind, age after age, has ex-

pended its best reflection, and now the result is an enlarged and systematized statement such as the early church could not have made, and did not need.

Compare, again, the statement of the doctrine of the Trinity in the Apostles' creed with that in the Nicene creed. The erroneous and defective statements of Arius compelled the orthodox mind to a more profound reflection upon the matter of Scripture, and the result was a creed in which the implication and potentiality of revelation was so far explicated and evolved as to present a distinct and unequivocal denial of the doctrine of a created Son of God. But, besides this negative value, this systematic construction of the Scripture doctrine of the Trinity has a great positive worth. It opens before the human mind the great abyss of the Divine nature; and, though it cannot impart to the finite intelligence that absolutely full and perfect knowledge of the Godhead which only God himself can have, it yet furnishes a form of apprehension, which accords with the real nature of God, and will, therefore, preserve the mind that accepts it from both the Dualistic and the Pantheistic ideas of the Supreme Being. Abstruse and dialectic as that creed has appeared to some minds and some ages in the Christian church; little connection as it has seemed to them to have with so practical a matter as vital religion; it would not be difficult to show that those councils at Nice and Constantinople, did a work in the years 325 and 381, of which the church universal will feel the salutary effects to the end of time, both in practical and scientific respects. For, if all right religious feeling towards Jesus Christ is grounded in the unassailable conviction that he is truly and verily God; "begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father;" then this creed laid down the systematic basis of all the true worship and acceptable adoration which the church universal have paid to the Redeemer of the world.¹ And if a correct metaphysical

¹ By this is not meant that there can be no true worship until a creed has been systematically formed and laid down, but that all true worship is grounded in a practical belief which, when examined, is found to harmonize exactly with the speculative results reached by the Christian Scientific mind. So far as the great body of believers is concerned, their case is like that of Hilary of Poitiers, who has left one of the best of the patristic treatises upon the Trinity, but who, in his retired bishopric in Gaul, did not hear of the Nicene creed until many years after its origin. He "found in it that very same doctrine of the unity of essence in the Father and the Son, which he had, before this, ascertained to be the true doctrine, from the study of the New Testament, and had received into

conception of the Divine Being is necessary in order to all right philosophizing upon God and the universe, then this Christian doctrine of the Trinity is the only statement that is adequate to the wants of science, and the only one that can keep the philosophic mind from the Pantheistic and Dualistic deviation to which, when left to itself, it is so liable.

The importance of historical studies and the historic spirit in an age of the world that more than any other suffers from false notions regarding the nature of progress and development, cannot be exaggerated. But he who is able to see in the creeds and symbols of the Christian church so many steps of real progress; he who knows that outside of that line of symbolic literature there is nothing but deviation from the real matter of Scripture, will not be likely to be carried away with the notion of a sudden and great improvement upon all that has hitherto been accomplished in the department of theology. He will know that, as all the past development has been historic; restatement shooting out of prestatement; the fuller creed bursting out of the narrower; the expanded treatise swelling forth growth-like from the more slender; so all the present and future development in theology must be historic also. He will see, especially, that elements that have already been examined and rejected by the Christian mind, as unscriptural and foreign, can never again be rightfully introduced into creeds and symbols; that history cannot undo history; that the progress of the present and the future must be homogeneous and kindred with the progress of the past.

III. In the third place, a historic spirit in the theologian protects him from false notions respecting the nature of the visible church, and from a false church feeling.

We can devote but a moment to this branch of the discussion, unusually important just at this time.

We have seen that the most important part of the history of the church is its inward history. We have found that the exter-

his Christian experience, without being aware that the faith which he bore in his heart, had been laid down in the form of a creed." — Torrey, Neander, II. 396.

Consonant with this, Hagenbach, after speaking of the highly scientific character of the *Symbolum Quicumque*, its endeavor, namely, to express the ineffable by its series of affirmations and guarding negations, adds, that "such formulæ nevertheless have their edifying no less than their scientific side, inasmuch as they testify to the struggle of the Christian mind after a satisfactory expression of that which has its full truth only in the depths of the believing heart and character." — *Dogmengeschichte*, third edition, p. 249, note.

nal history of Christianity derives all its interest for a thoughtful mind from its connection with that dispensation of truth and of spirit which lies beneath it as its animating soul. The whole influence, consequently, of genuine and comprehensive historical study is to magnify the substance and subordinate the form; to exalt truth, doctrine and life, over rites, ceremonies and politics.

It is undoubtedly true, that the study of ecclesiastical history, in some minds, and in some branches of the church, has strengthened a strong formalizing tendency, and promoted ecclesiasticism. The Papacy has from time immemorial appealed to tradition; and those portions of the Protestant church which have been least successful in freeing themselves from the materialism of the Papacy, have said much about the past history of the church. Hence, in some quarters in the Protestant church, there are, and always have been, apprehensions lest history should interfere with the great right of private judgment, and put a stop to all legitimate progress.

But it only needs a comprehensive idea of the nature of history to allay these apprehensions. It only needs to be remembered that the history of Christianity is something more than the history of the Nicene period or of the Scholastic age. It only needs to be recollected that the history of Christianity denotes a course of development from the beginning of the world down to the present moment; that it includes the whole of that Divine economy which began with the first promise, and which manifested itself first in the Patriarchal, next in the Jewish, and finally in the Christian church.¹ The influence of the study of this

¹ Probably the most serious defect in the construction of the History of Christianity by the school of Schleiermacher, springs from regarding the incarnation as the beginning of church history. Even if this is not always formally said, as it sometimes is, the notion itself moulds and forms the whole account. The golden position of Augustine, *Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet, Vetus in Novo patet*, is forgotten, and the Jewish religion, as it came from God, is confounded with that corruption of it which we find in the days of our Saviour, but against which the evangelical Prophet Isaiah inveighs as earnestly as the evangelical Apostle Paul. "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh." Judaism is not Phariseism. There is, therefore, no *inward* and *essential* difference between true Judaism and true Christianity. The former looked forward and the latter looks backward to the same central Person and the same central Cross. The manifested Jehovah of the Old Testament was the incarnate Word of the New. "The religion," says Edwards, "that the church of God has professed from the first founding of the church after the fall to this time, has always been the same. Though the dispensations have

whole great process, especially if the eye is kept fastened upon the spiritual substance of it, is anything but formalizing and sectarian. If, therefore, a papistic and anti-catholic temper has ever shown itself in connection with the study of ecclesiastical history, it was because the inward history was neglected, and even the external history was studied in sections only. He who selects a particular period merely, and neglects all that has preceded and all that has followed, will be liable to a sectarian view of the nature and history of the church of God. He who reproduces within his mind the views and feelings of a single age merely, will be individual and bigoted in his temper. He who confines his studies, for example, as so many have done, and are doing, to that period from Constantine to Hildebrand, which witnessed the rise and formation of the Papacy; and, especially, he, who in this period studies merely the archaeology and the polity, without the doctrines, the morality, and the life; he, who confines himself to those tracts of Augustine which emphasize the idea of the church in opposition to ancient radicals and disorganizers, but studiously avoids those other and greater and more elaborate treatises of this earnest spiritualist, which thunder the idea of the truth, in opposition to all heretics and all formalists; he, in short, who goes to the study of ecclesiastical history with a pre-determined purpose, and carries into it an antecedent interpreting idea, derived from his denomination, and not from Scripture, will undoubtedly become more and more Romish and less and less historic.

Such a disposition as this is directly crossed and mortified by

been altered, yet the religion which the church has professed, has always, as to its essentials, been the same. The church of God, from the beginning, has been one society. The Christian church which has been since Christ's ascension, is manifestly the same society continued, with the church that was before Christ came. The Christian church is grafted on their root; they are built upon the same foundation. The revelation upon which both have depended, is essentially the same; for, as the Christian church is built on the Holy Scriptures, so was the Jewish church, though now the Scriptures be enlarged by the addition of the New Testament; but still it is essentially the same revelation with that which was given in the Old Testament, only the subjects of Divine revelation are now more clearly recorded in the New Testament than they were in the Old. But the sum and substance of both the Old Testament and the New, is Christ and His redemption. The church of God has always been on the foundation of Divine revelation, and always on those revelations that were essentially the same, and which were summarily comprehended in the Holy Scriptures." — *Edward's Work of Redemption*, I. 473.

a comprehensive and philosophic conception of history. Especially will the history of doctrines destroy the belief in the infallibility, or *paramount* authority, of any particular portion of the church universal. The eye is now turned away from those external and imposing features of the history which have such a natural effect to carnalize the mind, to those simpler truths and interior living principles, which have a natural effect to spiritualize it. An interest in the theology of the church is very different from an interest in the polity of the church. It is a fact that as the one rises, the other declines; and there would be no surer method of destroying the formalism that exists in some portions of the church, than to compel their clergy to the continuous and close study of the entire history of Christian doctrines.

IV. In the fourth place, a historic spirit in theologians promotes a profound and genial agreement on essential points, and a genial disagreement on non-essentials.

It is plain that the study of church history tends to establish and to magnify the distinction between real orthodoxy and real heterodoxy. History is discriminating and cannot be made to mingle the immiscible. In regard, therefore, to the great main currents of truth and of error, the historic mind is clear in its insight and decided in its opinions. It knows that the Christian religion has been both truly and falsely apprehended by the human mind, and that, consequently, two lines of belief can be traced down the ages and generations; that in only one of these two, is Scriptural Christianity to be found.

But its wide and catholic survey, also enables the historic mind to see as the unhistoric mind cannot, that the line of orthodoxy is not a mathematical line. It has some breadth. It is a path, upon which the church can travel, and not merely a direction in which it can look. It is a high and royal road, where Christian men may go abreast; may pass each other, and carry on the practical business of a Christian life; and not a mere hair-line down which nought can go but the one-eyed sighting of either speculative or provincial bigotry.

Hence historical studies banish both provincialism and bigotry from a theological system, and imbue it with that practical and catholic spirit which renders it interesting and influential through the whole church and world. A system of theology may be true and yet not contain the whole truth. It may have seized upon some fundamental positions, or cardinal doctrines, with a too

violent energy, and have given them an exorbitant expansion, to the neglect of other equally fundamental truths. In this case, historical knowledge is one of the best correctives. A wider knowledge of the course of theological speculation; a more profound acquaintance with the origin and formation of the leading systems of the church universal, tends to produce that equilibrium of the parts and that comprehensiveness of the whole, which are so apt to be lacking in a provincial creed or system.

A similar liberalizing influence is exerted by the study of church history upon the theologian himself. He sees that men on the same side of the line which divides real orthodoxy from real heterodoxy, have differed from each other, and sometimes upon very important, though never upon vital, points. The history of Christian doctrine compels him to acknowledge that there is a theological space, within which it is safe for the theological scientific mind to expatiate and career; that this is a liberty conceded to the theologian by the unsystematized form in which the written revelation has been given to man, and a liberty, too, which, when it is not abused, greatly promotes that clearer and fuller understanding of the Scriptures, which we have seen the historic Christian mind is continually striving after.

But this scientific liberality among theologians leads directly to a more profound and genial agreement among them upon all practical and essential points. The liberality of the historic mind is very far removed from that mere indifferentism which sometimes usurps this name. There is a truth for which the disagreeing, and perhaps (owing to imperfectly sanctified hearts) the bitterly disagreeing, theologians would both be tied to one stake and be burnt with one fire. There is a vital and necessary doctrine for which, if it were assailed by a third party, a bitter unevangelic enemy, both of the contending orthodox divines would fight under one and the same shield. That truth which history shows has been the life of the church and without which it must die; that historic truth, which is the heritage and the joy of the whole family in heaven and on earth, is dear to both hearts alike.

But that which tends to make differing theologians agree, profoundly and thoroughly, upon essential points, also tends to make them differ generously and genially upon non-essentials. Those who know that, after all, they are one, in fundamental character, and in fundamental belief; that, after all their disputing, they

have but one Lord, one faith and one baptism; find it more difficult to maintain a bitter tone and to employ an exasperated accent toward each other. The common Christian consciousness wells up from the lower depths of the soul, and, as in those deep inland lakes which are fed from subterranean fountains, the sweet waters neutralize and change those bitter or brackish surface currents that have in them the taint of the shores; perhaps the washings of civilization.

While, therefore, a wide acquaintance with the varieties of statement which appear in scientific orthodoxy, does not in the least render the mind indifferent to that essential truth which every man must believe or be lost eternally, it at the same time induces a generous and genial temper among differing theologians. The controversies of the Christian church have unquestionably been a benefit to systematic theology, and that mind must have a very meagre idea of the comprehensiveness and pregnancy of Divine revelation, who supposes that the Christian mind could have derived out of it that great system of doctrinal knowledge which is to outlive all the constructions of the philosophic mind, without any sharp controversy, or keen examination among theologians. That structure did not and could not rise like Thebes, at the mellifluous sound of Amphion's lute; it did not rear itself up like the Jewish temple without sound of hammer, or axe, or any tool of iron. Slowly, and with difficulty, was it upreared, by hard toil, amid opposition from foes without and foes within, and through much earnest mental conflict. And so will it continue to be reared and beautified in the ages that are to come. We cannot alter this course of things so long as the truth is infinite, and the mind is finite and sees through a glass darkly.

What is needed, therefore, is a sweet and generous temper in all parties as the work goes on. The theologian needs that great ability: *the ability to differ genially*. It has been the misery and the disgrace of the church, that too many theologians who have held the truth, and have held it, too, in its best forms, have held it, like the heathen, in unrighteousness; have held it in narrowness and bigotry. They have differed in a hard, dry, ungenial way. They have forgotten that the rich man can afford to be liberal; that the strong man need not be constantly anxious; that a scientific and rigorous orthodoxy should ever look out of a beaming, and not a sullen, eye.

Let us be thankful that some ages in the history of the church furnish us examples that cheer and instruct. Look back at that most interesting period, the period of the Reformation, and contemplate the profound agreement upon essentials and the genial disagreement upon non-essentials, that prevailed among the leaders then. Martin Luther and John Calvin were two theologians who differed as greatly in mental structure, and in their spontaneous mode of contemplating and constructing doctrines, as is possible for two minds upon the same side of the great controversy between orthodoxy and heresy. No man will say that the differences between Lutheranism and Calvinism are minor or unimportant. Probably any one would say that, if those two men were able to feel the common Christian fellowship; to enjoy the communion of saints; and to realize with tenderness their common relationship to the Head of the church; there is no reason why all men who are properly within the pale of orthodoxy should not do the same.

Turn now to the letters of both of these men; written in the midst of that controversy which was going on between the two portions of the Reformed, and which resulted, not, however, through the desire or the influence of these two great men, but through the bitterness of their adherents, in their division into two distinct churches; and witness the common genial feeling that prevailed. Hear Luther in his letter to Bucer sending his cordial greeting to Calvin whose books he has read with singular pleasure: *cum singulari voluptate*. Hear Calvin declaring his willing and glad readiness to subscribe to the Augsburg Confession, interpreting it upon the sacramental question as the Lutherans themselves authorized him to do.¹ Above all, turn to that burst, from Calvin, of affectionate feeling towards Melancthon, which gives itself vent in the midst of one of his stern controversial tracts, like the music of flutes silencing for a moment the

¹ Henry's Life of Calvin, II. pp. 96, 99. It is interesting and instructive to witness the liberal feeling of the scientific and rigorously orthodox Athanasius towards the Semiarians themselves, whose statement of the doctrine of the Trinity he regarded to be inadequate. See the quotation from *Athanasius de Synodis*, § 41, in Gieseler, Chap. II. § 83, and the reference to *Hilarius de Synodis*, § 76. Says Augustine: "they who do not pertinaciously defend their opinion, false and perverse though it be, especially when it does not spring from the audacity of their own presumption, while they seek the truth with cautious solicitude, and are prepared to correct themselves when they have found it, are by no means to be ranked among heretics. — Epistle 43. Newman's Library Version.

clang of war-cymbals and the blare of the trumpet: "O Philip Melancthon, to thee I address myself, to thee who art now living in the presence of God with Jesus Christ, and there awaitest us, till death shall unite us in the enjoyment of Divine peace. A hundred times hast thou said to me, when weary with so much labor and oppressed with so many burdens, thou laidst thy head upon my breast, 'God grant, God grant, that I may now die!'"¹

The theology of Richard Baxter differs from the theology of John Owen by some important modifications, and each of these two types of Calvinism will probably perpetuate itself in the church to the end of time; but the confidence which both of these great men cherished towards each other, should go along down with these systems through the ages and generations of time.

But what surer method can be employed to produce and perpetuate this catholic and liberal feeling among the various types and schools of orthodox theology, than to impart to all of them the broad views of history? And what surer method than this can be taken to diminish the number and bring about more unity of opinion in the department of systematic theology? For it is one great effect of history to coalesce and harmonize. It introduces mutual modifications, by showing opponents that their predecessors were nearer together than they themselves are, by tracing the now widely separated opinions back to that point of departure where they were once very near together; and, above all, by causing all parties to remember, what all are so liable to forget in the heat of controversy, that all forms of orthodoxy took their first origin in the Scriptures, and that, therefore, all theological controversy should be carried on with a constant reference to this one infallible standard, which can teach but one infallible system.

I have thus considered the nature of the historic spirit and its influence both upon the secular and theological mind, in order to indicate my own deep sense of the importance of the department in which I have been called to give instruction by the guardians of this Institution. The first instinctive feelings would have shrunk from the weight of the great burden imposed, and the extent of the very great field opened; though in an institution where the pleasant years of professional study were all

¹ Henry's Life of Calvin, I. 239.

spent; though in an ancient institution, made illustrious and influential, through the land and the world, by the labors of the venerated dead and the honored living. But it does not become the individual to yield to his individuality. The stream of Divine Providence, so signally conspicuous in the life of the church, and of its members, is the stream upon which the diffident as well as the confident must alike cast themselves. And he who enters upon a new course of labor for the church of God, with just views of the greatness and glory of the kingdom, and of the comparative unimportance of any individual member, will be most likely to perform a work that will best harmonize with the development and progress of the great whole.

ARTICLE VII.

CHAUCER AND HIS TIMES.

By M. P. Case, M. A., Newburyport, Mass.

MR. ADDISON has somewhere said, that "a reader seldom peruses a book till he knows whether the author of it be a black or a fair man; of a mild or choleric disposition; married or bachelor, with other particulars of the like nature that conduce very much to the right understanding of an author." Whether we accept the assertion and adopt the implied conclusion or not, it is a fact that, in seeking for a life of many of the imperial geniuses of the world, we are obliged to reverse this process and read their biography chiefly in their works. Of Homer we know neither how nor where he lived nor when he died. Very little of outward biography has come to us of most of the great poets of antiquity; and, even in respect to Shakespeare, the most of his external life seems to have got equally beyond the research of the antiquary and the industry of the historian. How intense, indeed, would be our interest in the details of his early life, and that succession of years which intervened between his marriage and his flight to London, where his

genius first became known to the world. A life of Shakspeare, as full and reliable as Mr. Lockhart has given us of Scotland's great novelist, would be *the* book for its time, in the English language. But while the works of the great bard are everywhere known, read and admired, in every language which has a literature in Christendom, the bard himself stands before us a dim and shadowy form, as much almost a mythical character as a historical reality.

Geoffrey Chaucer, the father of English verse, is no exception to this unfortunate rule. While of his writings no inconsiderable amount has come down to our day, all that we are sure of respecting his external life and relations, may be brought within the compass of a few pages. The man Chaucer, as he lived and moved among men,—the courtier, the citizen, the poet,—we would fain behold with more distinctness than veritable history will at present allow. His contemporaries are provokingly silent respecting him. Even Sir John Froissart, himself a poet who must have known him well, hardly mentions his name, though inclined to gossip of every body whom he knew. Was the aristocratic old canon jealous of his brother poet? Or, what is more probable, did he purposely pretend ignorance of the man who did not scruple to satirize the corrupt ecclesiastics of his time?

As he has told us himself, he was a native of London; and, as the inscription on his tomb in Westminster Abbey tells us, he was born in 1328, one year after the accession of Edward III., whose long and eventful reign is distinguished in English history. His father has been supposed to have been a merchant, which is certainly very possible, when we see everywhere in his writings proofs of a minute knowledge of the world in its every-day aspects. Having finished such preparatory studies as were at that day required, he entered the University of Cambridge, where, according to Mr. Godwin, there were gathered six thousand students.

Whatever his birth, or social position in life, he could not have lived many years in London, as it then was, without decided results. He had ample opportunity of knowing and remarking upon the growth of that rising rank of men, the burgesses, who were even then beginning, as they afterwards completed, an entire change in the political constitution of the country. Of his youth and early manhood we further learn that he pursued the study of law, and became early known as a poet; and this

is nearly all, if we except one other act of that youthful age, which has some significance, one might suppose, his flogging a Franciscan friar in the streets of London, for which, according to an old record, he was fined two shillings. We cannot learn the cause of this castigation; but if there was even a tolerable provocation, the poet must have felt that the speculation did not on the whole prove a very bad one.

Mr. Hume has remarked that there is not a reign in English history which deserves more to be studied than that of Edward III. It has its interest for the politician as marking the era when the foundations of political and social liberty were laid. Although more than a century had elapsed since at Runnymede the Magna Charta had been wrested from the hands of despotic power, that power, never quite satisfied with its loss, omitted no opportunity to regain its original strength; but the spirit of liberty had struggled again and again to maintain its ground, and had now gained at least one great victory. It had become a recognized fact, that all orders of men had rights and privileges which no king might take away. Contemporaneous with these struggles of freedom, and as their cause, doubtless, in no small measure, there had been going on that singular process, so puzzling to the historian, of a thoroughly subdued and despised race gradually rising from beneath the feet of their oppressors, and, at length, effectually taking the place of the dominant power. Two centuries and a half before, the battle of Hastings and the victory of William the Norman had given the whole nation into the hands of the conqueror. Seldom does history show us a more complete subjugation of one race by another. And the victor took, to human view, the most effective methods to secure and perpetuate his power. The native owners of the soil were made slaves, degraded or kept from every post of honor; their very language was excluded from all the higher spheres of life; and, to such a degree was this degrading process carried, that, as Mr. Macaulay tells us, it became an ordinary form of indignant denial with a Norman gentleman: "Do you take me for an Englishman." And yet a single century had hardly passed before the descendants of that same gentleman were proud to claim kindred with the English race.

This singular elevation of an enslaved race had become complete in the age of Chaucer. The nation was now properly English. The French language had been banished from legal

courts, and the English had begun to take its place in the castle and the palace. The long and fierce struggles between Edward and the French finally sundered all ties which bound England to the Continent, and resulted in that antipathy towards her Gallic neighbors, which lives in the English bosom even to the present hour.

For the literary man also, no less than for the politician, do the times of Chaucer possess peculiar interest. For then it was that the night of barbarism which had for centuries hung over Europe, was beginning to pass away. The day of science and learning had dawned. Petrarch and Boccaccio in Italy, and Chaucer in England, were among the most conspicuous heralds of that glorious dawn. During the latter half of the fourteenth century, Italy was truly "a busy laboratory of ancient literature." It was the glory of her princes to aid the cause of letters; they expended immense sums in founding libraries and galleries of art. Here was a zealous reformation, and, what does not often happen, a reformation without radicalism. The restoration of learning was but the restoration of a healthful conservatism; for letters are essentially preservative of rational liberty and wholesome laws. What of generous learning yet tarried in Constantinople, had begun to hear an inquiring voice in Italy and western Europe; and the answering word was not delayed. This but stimulated the enthusiasm; and then commenced the general hunt for manuscripts. Smyrna, Alexandria, and other cities of the East, were visited by eager aspirants for the honor of discovery. To have discovered a classic manuscript was matter of almost as much exultation as to have found a new continent. Even merchant princes joined in the exciting work; and not seldom were ships from the Levant and the Bosphorus freighted with the treasures of literature as well as with more legitimate articles of commerce. The universities, from Italy to England, were thronged with young men, at last for other purposes, we must think, than Mr. Hume supposes, "to learn bad Latin and worse logic." About the middle of the fourteenth century, a chronicler informs us, that there were thirty thousand students in Oxford alone.

We do not say that in this age either literature or liberty had gained full sway. There was much of ignorance and much of despotism yet remaining; and, though the dark pall of barbarism which had for so many ages rested on the nations, was raised,

yet many of its ponderous folds still swept the ground. In England, especially, though commerce had commenced a vigorous growth and the corner-stone of freedom had been securely laid; though those grand old architectural piles, now the admiration of every foreigner, were in process of rearing; though most or all of the refinement which belonged to chivalry in its best days yet remained, there was still much of ignorance and vice, of vulgar luxury and barbaric splendor. But the first great achievements of civilization had been made; a light had risen which for five hundred years has been gaining to itself brightness and glory.

The age of Chaucer, moreover, claims the attention of all Protestants, for it was also the age of Wiclif, who was born in 1324, four years before the poet. Both, indeed, belonged to the same liberal party, and the poet was no more a friend to papal aggression than was the intrepid doctor. The absurdities which were easily practised upon the ignorant and superstitious, were not alone manifest to the better informed class; the good sense and shrewdness of the unlettered commons had begun also to penetrate the flimsy exterior, with which ghostly cunning had invested them, and to demand their removal. The Reformation had not yet become a fact; but the forces of which it was the resultant, were even then in vigorous activity. The abuses of the church, which had been accumulating for ages, become at length a mass reeking with corruption, and hanging upon the vitals of society like a burdensome and putrid disease. A cure was, indeed, possible, but it was to be no easy thing. As the human mind gradually awoke from its long lethargy, it became aware of the presence of this disease, and, with the instinctive promptings of self-preservation, cast about for the remedy, which for long years it was not destined to find. The sickly body felt its malady and groaned being burdened, though the deliverance was not yet. Thus in England the abominations of ecclesiastical power were almost as distinctly condemned by Wiclif and his party in the fourteenth century, as they were by Luther in the sixteenth. And not in England only; in Italy even, popular writers did not hesitate to ridicule the unworthy practices of the ecclesiastics; and the fact that this was so common proves not only the extent of the evil, but also that the people to some extent were aware of it. How Chaucer dealt with them we shall have occasion to notice hereafter.

Wiclif did not, any more than Luther, become a reformer

from any premeditated purpose; for, until he was nearly fifty years of age, he was known chiefly as a learned priest, skilled in all the scholastic lore of his time, which, with his unusual talents, he was ever ready to consecrate to the service of the church. And it was only when one or two enormous abuses had been thrust upon his notice, and he had found, as did Luther, in his own experience, that the *healing* of such evils was not in accordance with the genius of popery, that he fully awoke to a knowledge of the true source and vast extent of the mischief. He had observed from time to time the character and influence of the Mendicant Friars,

“White, black, and grey, with all their trumpery,”

who, at that time, had grown from very modest beginnings and pretensions, to be a universal nuisance. While impressing the people with a belief in their superior sanctity and humility, they used the influence thus acquired, to replenish their coffers, which in those days were not apt to be empty; for, under the garb of poverty, and pretending entire disregard for all comforts and luxuries, they resorted to every device which a perverse ingenuity could supply, to drain the people of their well-earned pence; and with such success that vast sums accrued to their respected orders. The honest and straightforward doctor saw the abuse and fearlessly attacked it in a tractate containing various heads of impeachment, with abundance of plain talking. He declares therein, that the Friars are most dangerous enemies to Church and State, inasmuch as they interfere with the curates in the performance of their appropriate duties, and rob poor people, on false pretences, of immense sums of money. After such plain dealing he had of course no favor to expect from the Friars. They became his sworn enemies.

Another and a bolder push of papal power stirred the soul of Wiclif to its depths; as, indeed, it roused the spirit of every true Englishman. Urban V., in the depth of his weakness, as if struck with some strange madness, demanded tribute of Edward III. when at the summit of his power. The weak and cowardly John, it is true, had been frightened into an oath of fealty to the pope, during his reign; but the people never had sanctioned this silly act, and, though tribute had been formerly paid, it was always done reluctantly and irregularly, while for thirty-three years the pontificate had been wisely silent respect-

ing such preposterous vassalage. Wiclif was among the first to raise his voice against the audacious demand. He defended his country against such a disgrace, and stimulated the people to repel it. A parliament was summoned (one of the seventy assembled during this reign), which, after a short deliberation, decided unanimously — the bishops with the rest — that no king could alienate the sovereignty to any foreign power, without consent of parliament, and that, if the pope should proceed against the king of England as his vassal, the whole nation ought to rise at once in defence of its rights. We hear no more of tributary claims from that time downward. Wiclif was soon after made one of the chaplains of the king.

It was, however, not till the reformer had found that the suppression of error and abuse formed no part of the policy of the church, that we hear him saying: "It is lawful for kings, in cases limited by law, to take away temporalities from churchmen who habitually abuse them;" and again: "An ecclesiastic, even the pope of Rome, may on some occasions be corrected by his subjects; and, for the benefit of the church, may be impeached by both clergy and laity." After having been repeatedly tried for heresy, and having in this way acquired, as no otherwise he could have done, an insight into the animating spirit of the papacy, his course became more and more aggressive. He exposed errors, combatted unreasonable assumptions, translated the Scriptures into English, and made many converts to his opinions. In fact, the fourteenth century seemed fast becoming the era of reformation. And why should it not be so? The most liberal, and one of the wisest kings England had ever seen, was upon the throne. The spirit of civil and ecclesiastical liberty was rife among the people, and the reformers were patronized by those high in power. Truly was there reason to hope for the future. But the rising day was destined to be obscured. Though Wiclif himself was taken away from the coming gloom, in due time it fell, and when the wrath of heresy-hunters could not touch nor harm the "Evangelic Doctor" himself, with impotent rage it desecrated his tomb, dragging forth his bones from their forty years' rest and giving them to the flames. The hope of reform was crushed, but not forever. A day of reckoning was to come.

Whoever seeks the cause of this failure, may find it partly in the injudicious conduct of Wiclif's associates and succes-

sors, and partly in such mobocratic spirits as Wat Tyler and John Ball. These last are not unusual accompaniments of every genuine reform; though by no means, as is sometimes supposed, its offspring. They are rather the legitimate children of previous oppression. Our own righteous revolution had its adjuncts of radicalism and rank infidelity, which did it no small hurt. With Luther's reformation, the anabaptists sprung into being. And liberty in France is to-day dying under the blows it has received from its professed friends of the Red Republican stamp. Crazy John Ball preaching communism, with Jack Straw and Wat Tyler sowing sedition and exciting insurrections among the people, awakened the fears of all good citizens, who, seeing anarchy just before them, as a chain of evils, fell back into the arms of despotism.

Any notice of this interesting epoch, however brief, would be incomplete without some allusion to the family of Edward III. For it is not a common thing to meet with such a family in the annals of royalty. Edward himself was a stalwart knight, bold and chivalrous on the field, wise and discreet in council. His queen, Philippa of Hainault, was not only a model queen, intensely interested for the good of the realm, and sharing with her husband the cares, and to some extent the labors, of the government, but also a model wife and mother. Their marriage was not, as was too often the case in those times, an affair of state-policy, in which the most interested parties were the mere puppets of managing princes; it was grounded on thorough personal acquaintance and a mutual regard, which, when we consider their position and the times in which they lived, was unusually steadfast through a union of more than forty years. Not many things in the history of royal families, are more touching than Froissart's unvarnished chronicle of this excellent lady's death. "When the good queen," says he, "perceived that her end approached, she called to the king, and extending her right hand from under the bed-clothes, put it into the right hand of King Edward, who was oppressed with sorrow, and thus spoke:

"'We have, my husband, enjoyed our long union in peace, happiness and prosperity. But I entreat you before I depart, and we are forever separated in the world, that you will grant me three requests.' King Edward with sighs and tears replied: 'Lady, name them; whatever be your requests they shall be granted.' 'My lord,' she said, 'I beg you will fulfil whatever

engagements I have entered into with merchants for their wares as well on this as on the other side of the sea; I beseech you to fulfil whatever gifts or legacies I have made, or left, to churches wherein I have paid my devotions, and to all my servants, male or female; and, when it shall please God to call you hence, you will choose no other sepulchre than mine, and that you will lie by my side in the 'tloisters of Westminster Abbey.' The king in tears replied, 'Lady, all this shall be done.'

"Soon after," continues the chronicler, "the good lady made the sign of the cross on her breast, and having recommended to the king her youngest son, Thomas, who was present, praying to God, she gave up her spirit which I firmly believe was caught by holy angels and carried to the glory of heaven, for she had never done anything by thought or deed to endanger her soul."

This good queen, though the mother of twelve children whom she nurtured and educated herself, was ever busy with plans and deeds of general benevolence. She was the patroness of learning and the useful arts. Soon after her marriage, having hardly reached womanhood, she interested herself in the introduction of woollen manufactories into England from her own country, for which a monastic chronicler utters this benediction: "Blessed be the memory of Edward III. and Philippa of Hainault, his queen, who first invented clothes;"¹ i. e. the making of wool into cloth. Queen's College, Oxford, took its name in honor of Philippa, and received her patronage as far as the royal purse, in those days never full, would allow. And her children were worthy of their patronage; accomplished and virtuous beyond most of their time. The heroic Black Prince, centering in himself the warmest love of his parents and their fondest hopes; as distinguished for his valor and his virtue as for his manly beauty; "John of Gaunt, time-honored Lancaster," the brave champion and patron of the reformers; and Lionel, gigantic in stature and noble in heart, were sons of whom any king might reasonably be proud. The daughters, too, did honor to the matronly training and virtues of their mother. One of them, the Countess of Pembroke, was one of the most learned ladies of her time, and the patroness of Chaucer, as was Philippa herself. If the vast labors performed by this family, the hardships they voluntarily endured, and the dangers they braved, may be taken for a specimen, royalty was no sinecure in those times.

¹ Miss Strickland's *Queens of England*.

Such, in brief, was the age and such were the contemporaries of Chaucer. It was an era of great national importance to England, and of great interest to the world, as being the dawn of a returning day of commerce, art, liberty and letters. Old superstitions had begun to totter on their foundations, and free thought was struggling for a free utterance. One of those great transition-periods which society witnesses at long intervals of time, had commenced. Chaucer was a man of his age. He looked at the future in common with his generation, and was not an indifferent spectator on the theatre of his times. He was not merely a man of letters; he was also a man of the world, holding political office and receiving political emolument. It has been supposed that he travelled in early life; but it is more certain that he was early connected with the court of Edward (at that time the most splendid in Europe), and received various appointments from his sovereign, among which was that of ambassador to Genoa, in the year 1372. Petrarch was at this time residing in Padua, and there is some proof that he visited that accomplished scholar and restorer of learning. But granting this to be only a fiction of the antiquaries, it is quite obvious that this Italian journey was made to add very materially to his already acquired stores of learning, and had a direct bearing upon his literary character and writings. He tells us explicitly that he learned the story of Patient Griselda, from "Francis Petrarch, a learned clerk of Padua." Many of his tales are translations or imitations of popular Italian stories.

That Chaucer, before his connection with the English court, had distinguished himself by his poetical productions, is quite certain; but there is little reason to suppose that it was to this that he owed any special preferment. That was an age when mere courtly accomplishments would win royal favor far sooner than the productions of genius. Most probably he owed his promotion to the Duke of Lancaster; to whose interests he was attached, and who ultimately became his brother-in-law. He became thus indirectly allied to royalty, an uncommon, if not an unlawful, thing for poets. Politically allied to Lancaster, he espoused the doctrines of Wiclif, of whom the duke was a steadfast friend and defender. His party earnestly engaged in promoting reforms both in Church and State. But the enterprise, as we have already seen, ended in disaster and defeat; and the whole party was broken and scattered. After remaining some

time in Zealand, as an exile, he was induced to return again to his home; but former friends proved false; potent enemies prevailed against him, and he was cast into prison. How long he remained in confinement is uncertain; but he has told us, "every hour seemed an hundred winters."

This history of his fall from influence; of his exile; his imprisonment and subsequent release, is enveloped in obscurity. It has been said that he regained his liberty by betraying his associates. But this needs proof; and all his life of which we are certain, indicates that he could never have been a traitor. He might have made some revelations respecting those former friends who deserted him in his banishment, and left him to languish in a dungeon; and to them, indeed, he owed no favors; but Lancaster he could not certainly have betrayed, for that prince afterward was his steadfast friend and protector. After his release, the wheel of fortune turned again in his favor. Under the reign of Richard II. Lancaster was again in power, Chaucer was reinstated in office, receiving for his civil labors a generous compensation. His later days were spent in retirement and ease, and it was in this quiet evening of his life, the storms having all passed away, that he wrote his best poems; those which stand forth as the prominent works of his genius. He died in 1400, seventy-two years of age.

The thing that strikes the ordinary reader most obviously, on first opening a volume of Chaucer, is the strangeness, the foreign air of the language. He seems to have fallen upon an unknown tongue. And this suggests to us a peculiar difficulty with which the writer of that day had to struggle. The English tongue, if such it could be called, was a rude mass, *rudis indigestaque moles*, a material the most unpromising possible for genius to find an utterance in. The French had been used by the higher classes, Latin by the learned, and the Saxon by the common people; and during the period of Norman ascendancy, for more than two centuries, the Anglo Saxon had ceased to be a written language. It was only a dialect of slaves, the *patois* of a crushed and despised race. It must, therefore, have suffered much and lost much since the days of Alfred. But, as fast as the indomitable Saxon rose from his condition of serfdom, he brought his native tongue along with him into the higher spheres of life; and with the elevation of the race came also the elevation of the language. Still, it was as yet the tongue of a barbarous and ignorant people,

equally unfit for the philosophic and the poetic muse. Chaucer as an Englishman, partaking of that national pride which the rising power of the realm had so naturally awakened, would not be likely to use a foreign language as a medium for the inspiration of his genius. There was left for him but one other course to pursue. He must take the yet mechanical mixture, the unallegated languages, and form a dialect for himself as best he could, through which he might speak to his own and succeeding ages. This was a task the difficulty of which we shall not be likely at once to appreciate; but the poet shrunk not from it. Right manfully did he put his hand to the work; and the success he attained, is well reckoned one of the proudest achievements in literature or art. Rarely, if ever, has the history of letters recorded such a phenomenon as we here behold. A great genius, one of the world's elect bards, arises in a country and in an age where the language is an unfit and an insufficient medium for his utterances, and where he must not only create his forms and conceptions, but in some sense, the language also, with which to clothe them. As we behold Chaucer thus carving from the French, the Latin, and the Saxon, as from a mixed, raw material, hard and unyielding, a language for himself, we are reminded of the theory which represents Homer as choosing a form, now from one dialect and now from another, and working all together into a Divine harmony. But how great the contrast, even supposing the theory correct, between the two. The dialects of those old Greeks were exquisitely perfect, flexible to the last degree for all purposes of poetry and philosophy; even in that far distant heroic age fit dialects for the gods. And so it has usually happened, that genius has found, already formed to its hand, a language fitted for its purposes. The Homeric Greek was exactly adapted to the simple, lifelike and beautiful descriptions with which the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* everywhere abound. It never fails the immortal poet, whether seeking appropriate epithets for Paris or Agamemnon; describing the death-struggle between Hector and Achilles; or with delicate hand depicting that pathetic meeting between Andromache and her husband, as he was going forth to engage in that series of conflicts in which he was destined to meet an untimely fate. And so in a later age, when Aeschylus would represent to the Athenian people those grand old myths of an earlier time with their sublime morality, he found a language capable of giving form, as was his

own lofty imagination of giving conception, to those noble tragedies, which, in stately grandeur, stand the first in rank, as they were the first in time, of all high dramatic poetry. The same may be said of Cicero and Virgil; of Shakspeare, Goethe and Milton.

To this general rule Chaucer is a singular, almost a solitary exception. The mixed material in which he wrought, was neither Pentelic nor Parian marble, but rather a sort of conglomerate, tough, crabbéd and hard. A slight inspection shows us the difficulties with which the poet struggled. But if the language fails, not so the writer. As Mr. D'Israeli has finely remarked: "the material from which he sculptured has betrayed the noble hand of the artist; the statue was finished; but the gray and spotty veins come forth clouding its lucid whiteness." In this bold and successful attempt, Chaucer has not only given proof of his own great power; he has also done most signal service to the cause of letters. He is almost as much the father of the English language as of English poetry. To him belongs the high honor of standing foremost among those who began that process of fusing into the Anglo Saxon appropriate words of foreign birth, which has adapted the English, by its strength, its simplicity and its variety, to be, as it is fast becoming, the most universal language of the civilized world.

The want of chronology which belongs to Chaucer's life, belongs also to his writings. With few exceptions we can assign no certain date to his numerous poems. If we cannot have the chronology of his outward life, it would be worth something to be able to trace the history of his genius step by step, through all its transitions, "kindling the cold ashes of translation into the fire of invention; from cloudy allegory breaking forth into the sunshine of the loveliest landscape-painting; and from the amatory romance, gliding into that vein of humor and satire, which, in his old age, poured forth a new creation." But of this neither he nor his contemporaries tell us much. From his first poem to his last and greatest work, the *Canterbury Tales*, an interval reaching over a space of forty-six years, nearly all succession is lost. It would be interesting, indeed, to know when and where this man of business, this court gentleman, dwelt with the Muses during all those forty-six years; but we are left here only to dubious conjecture.

Of Chaucer's translations, "the *Romance of the Rose*" ranks

the first, whether we regard the intrinsic character of the piece, or the translator's execution of his task. Mr. Warton has given copious extracts from it, with the parallel passages in the French, by comparing which it appears to have lost nothing by its transfer into another tongue. It was the most celebrated allegory of the old French poetry, and was an early favorite with Chaucer. In his youth, long before he translated it, as he tells us in his "Dreme," he used to imagine its scenes and characters painted on the walls of his chamber as he lay musing upon his couch. In its imaginative character, the strength and boldness of its descriptions, the splendor of its scenes and the distinctness of its characters, it was well suited to the poet's own tastes and genius. The whole poem, which is long and sometimes tedious, is the product of a gorgeous imagination; and shows, as do many of the tales of that age, unquestionable evidence of its oriental origin. For the East was the birthplace not of religion and philosophy only; in the Orient, also, sprung the germs of many a story which modern genius has recast, but which may be easily traced through German or Italian media, to an earlier Arabic literature, that, like a brilliant Aurora of the north, flashed athwart the darkness of the Middle Ages.

It is the opinion of Mr. Campbell, that the two capital allegories of Chaucer, are his "House of Fame" and the "Flower and the Leaf," both of which have been paraphrased in modern English; the former by Pope, and the latter by Dryden. And certainly they must rank high among the poet's works. Both show the working of that genial and fertile imagination, which places Chaucer in the first rank of poets; though it must be confessed that, in the "House of Fame," this imagination borders sometimes upon an excess of luxuriance. It contains a fine satire upon the caprice of Fame; and, under its gorgeous and sometimes grotesque exterior, lurks many a valuable moral. Pope, in his imitation of this allegory, has endeavored to remove its extravagances and substitute beauties of his own. He has given us here, as in his other translations, fine verses and specimens of elegant diction. But here, as elsewhere, he has failed to render the spirit of the poem. Neither Dante nor Chaucer nor Homer can be well translated by those whose culture belongs exclusively to a more refined, and, consequently, to a more artificial age. In trying to change the dress, Pope has changed the species. Mr. Warton has well said: "An attempt to unite order

and exactness of imagery with a subject formed on principle so professedly romantic and anomalous, is like giving Corinthian pillars to a Gothic palace. When I read Pope's elegant imitation of this piece, I think I am walking among the modern ornaments unsuitably placed in Westminster Abbey."

The "Flower and the Leaf," is an exquisite fancy-piece, concealing under its beautiful imagery a yet more beautiful moral. It belongs to a species of poetry, popular in that day, which sprang up after the decline of the famous old Provencial, and which Froissart, as well as Chaucer, was fond of cultivating. It consisted of short pieces, of a highly allegorical character, and mostly in the pastoral style; and, as Mr. Warton supposes, took its peculiar type from the Floral games instituted by Clementine, Countess of Toulouse, in the year 1324, and annually celebrated in the month of May. At these games all the poets in France were assembled in artificial arbors dressed in flowers, where he who produced the best poem, was rewarded with a violet of gold. Other prizes were conferred for inferior productions. Meanwhile the conquerors were crowned with wreaths of natural flowers. Rewards so conferred in such an age must certainly have been a powerful stimulus to such poetic genius as then existed in the land.¹

In this little poem, so full of vernal scenes and fairy work, a lady is represented as placed in a delicious arbor, cool and fresh, full of sweet odors, and thickly interwoven with eglantine. Troops of knights and ladies soon advance, some, subjects to a Lady of the Flower, and some, to a Lady of the Leaf; and all are decked with the ornaments of spring. Besides, in agreement with the taste of the times, the whole array glitter with gold and precious stones, and are preceded by minstrels in vestments of green. Some of the company do obeisance to the Flower, and others to the Leaf of the Daisy. The lady in the arbor, puzzled to know the meaning of this display, is informed that those who worship the flower, denote the followers of Indolence and Pleasure; as Dryden paraphrases the passage:

Who, nursed in idleness and trained in courts,
Passed all their precious hours in sports,
Till death behind, came stalking on unseen,
And withered, like the storm, the freshness of their green;
These and their mates enjoy the present hour,
And, therefore, pay their homage to the flower.

¹ Warton's *History of English Poetry*, II. 223.

The Leaf symbolizes perseverance, virtue and honorable fame; its worshippers, therefore, are those who seek for permanent excellence. In this allegorical style are many of Chaucer's poems; and in adopting it he followed no less the promptings of his own imagination, than the tastes of his age. The allegory was a favorite with the readers of that time, if we may judge from its preponderance among the productions of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

But in the *Canterbury Tales*, our poet leaves this fanciful region where he had so fondly lingered, and places before us persons and scenes of the most matter-of-fact kind possible. This was his last and greatest work; the labor of his old age. And we cannot forbear repeating here, what, indeed, has often been remarked before, that some of the best and freshest works of genius have been produced late in life. "Old" and "blind" are the legendary epithets of Homer. We are the better assured of the story of Sophocles, that, when in extreme age having been accused by his elder sons as being childish and unfit to manage his affairs, he simply read to the judges, by way of defence, that noble tragedy, the *Edipus at Colonus*, just composed; on hearing which, they not only acquitted him without consultation, but bore him in triumph to his home. We remember, too, that Milton might have been called an old man when he finished the grandest epic of modern days. Of Young it has been said, that he wrote nothing worthy of the name of poetry till he was over sixty years of age. Cowper was over fifty when he wrote "*The Task*." In like manner, Chaucer was sixty-four when he finished his master-piece. So true it is, that the imagination does not of necessity decline with the body in which it dwells; for true genius never grows old.

About thirty years previous, Boccaccio had written, in Italy, the *Decameron*, a series of one hundred tales, which he supposes to have been related as follows. During the plague in Florence, in 1348, ten young persons of both sexes went into the country for purposes of health; and, desiring to spend ten days agreeably together, it was agreed that each in turn should tell one story a day for that period. This collection of stories had become popular throughout Europe, and the critics have generally supposed that Chaucer here found a hint from which he constructed the *Canterbury Tales*. But this should hardly have been mentioned, since Chaucer's plan is every way superior to that of Boccaccio,

whether we consider the skill of his design, or the ingenuity of its execution. He supposes that, in early spring, when April, with its fertilizing showers and "zephyr with its sweet breath," were tempting forth alike the traveller and the pilgrim, a company of twenty-nine persons met of an evening at the Tabard, an inn at Southwark, near London, on a pilgrimage to Thomas a Becket's tomb at Canterbury. They are of various ages; of differing occupations, and represent every grade of that great middle class, which was even then a peculiarity in English social life. In the group we find a monk, a merchant, a scholar, a friar, a ploughman, a miller, a sailor, a parson, a seller of indulgences, a doctor of physic, and, to mention no more, a lady prioress and the wife of Bath. Their object being a common and a religious one, and being assembled, as was the custom of the time, at a common table, a sort of travelling acquaintance is formed at once. At the suggestion of "mine host," who seems to have been well adapted to entertain his guests, they agree not only to pursue the remainder of their journey together, but also, in order to relieve the tedium of the way, that each should divert the company in turn by a story; and that he who should tell the best tale should have a supper at the expense of the others. The host enters right earnestly into the plan, appoints himself judge in the pleasant strife, and prepares to accompany the travellers on their way in the morning.

In his prologue to the tales, the poet portrays the travellers one by one, by a few bold and skilful touches; but each picture is exceedingly graphic and intensely individual, and together they constitute a gallery of characters which will hardly find a parallel. We are aware of the difficulty of verifying what we have said, by brief and imperfect extracts, but cannot quite resist the temptation to give them; for, if no other object is accomplished thereby, we shall thus give some specimens of the English language as it was nearly five hundred years ago.¹

The *prioress* is chiefly remarkable for over nicety and affectation of excessive delicacy. She could speak French "full fair," but, as is not unusual in our day, it was a questionable kind of French.

After the schole of Stratford atte bowe
For French of Paris was to her unknowe.

¹ The extracts are from Tyrwhitt's London edition, 1843.

She was, moreover, endued with an overwrought sensibility, which the poet touches with a gentle hand.

She was so charitable and so pitous
 She wolde wepe if that she saw a mous
 Caughte in a trappe, if it were ded or blodde.
 Of smalle houndes hadde she that she fedde
 With rosted flesh, and milk, and wartel brede,¹
 But sore wept she if on of hem were dede.

The Doctor of Physic was a prodigy of learning.

He knew the cause of every maladie
 Were it of cold or hot or moist or drie
 And where engendered and of what humor,
 He was veray parfite practisour.

After enumerating, however, his great accomplishments, and giving the catalogue of his library, he could not forbear to add a gentle touch of satire.

His study was but litel on the Bible.

And also :

— since gold in physic is a cordial
 He loved gold in special.

The burly Miller stands before us with sufficient distinctness.

The Miller was a stout carl² for the nones³
 Ful bigge was he of braun and eke of bones
 * * * * *
 He was short ehuldered, brode, a thikke gnarre⁴
 Ther n' as no dore, that he n' olde heve of barre
 Or breke it, at a renning⁵ with his hede.
 His berd as any sowe or fox was rede,
 And thereto brode, as though it were a spade.
 Upon the cop right of his nose he hade
 A wert, an thevon stode a tufte of heres
 Rede as the bristles of a sowes eres.
 His nose-thirles⁶ black were and wide
 A sword and bokeler bore he by his side.

* * * * *

The Steward is quite as remarkable in his way.

The Reve was a slendere colerike man
 His berd was shave as nighe as ever he can ;

¹ Cake-bread, made of fine flour.

² Churl.

³ For the occasion.

⁴ A tough or hard knot.

⁵ Running.

⁶ Nostrils.

His here was by his eres round ¹ yshorne;
 His top was docked like a preest beforne;
 Ful longe were his legges and ful lene
¹ Ylike a staff, ther was no calf-ysene.

* * * *

Not so the Monk, fond of hunt and hounds and good cheer.

A Monk was ther, a fayer for the maistrie ²
 An out-rider that loved vinerie ³
 A manly man, to ben an abbot able,
 Full many a deinte hors hadde he in stable.

* * * *

What shulde he studie, and make himselven wood,
 Upon a book in cloistre alway to pore,
 Or swinken ⁴ with his handes, and laboure,
 As Austin bit ⁵ how shall the world be served?
 Let Austin have his swink ⁶ to him reserved.

* * * *

I saw his sleeves purfild at the hond
 With gris ⁷ and that the finest of the lond.
 And for to fasten his hood under his chinne,
 He hadde of gold ywrought a curious pinne;
 A love knotte in the greter end ther was.
 His hed was balled, and shone as any glas;
 And eke ⁸ his face as it hadde ben anointe,
 He was a lord ful fat in good point,
 His eyen stepe ⁹ and rolling in his hed
 That stemed as a forneis of a led.
 His botes souple, his hors in gret estat.
 Now certainly he was a fayre prelat,
 He was not pale as a forepined ¹⁰ gost;
 A fat swan loved he best of any rost.

* * * *

The Friar, also, sits for his likeness.

A Frere ther was, a wanton and a merry,
 A Limitour, ¹¹ a ful solempne man.
 In all the orders foure is non that can
 So moche of dalliance and fayre langage,
 He hadde ymade ful many a mariage
 Of yonge wimmen at his owen cost.
 Until his ordre he was a noble post.

* * * *

¹ The y is a Saxon prefix with apparently no signification in Chaucer's time.

² I. e. fair above the others, v. Tyrwhitt. ³ Hunting. ⁴ Toil.

⁵ Bade, or commanded. ⁶ Labor. ⁷ Edged with fur. ⁸ Also.

⁹ His eyes deep set. ¹⁰ Wasted away.

¹¹ A mendicant licensed to beg in a particular district.

And over all ther as profit shuld arise
 Curteis he was and lowly of servise
 Ther m' as no man nowher so vertuons;
 He was the beste beggar in all his hous,
 And gave a certaine ferme¹ for the grant.
 Non of his bretheren came in his haunt,
 For though a widewe hadde but a shoo
 (So plesant was his *in principio*),
 Yet wold he have a ferthing or he went.

From Chaucer's description of the seller of indulgences, it would seem that this official inspired little more respect in him than did Tetzel a hundred and fifty years later in Luther.

This pardoner had here as yelwe as wax
 But smoth it heng² as doth a strike of flax;
 By unces³ heng his lokkes that he hadde,
 And therwith he his shulders overspradde
 * * * * *
 His wallet lay beforne him on his lappe
 Bret-ful⁴ of pardons, come from Rome all hote,
 A vois he hadde as smale as hath a gote;
 No berd hadde he ne never non shulde have
 As smothe it was as it were newe shave.

He plies his craft, however, with great success.

For in his male⁵ he hadde a pilwebere,⁶
 Which, as he saide, was our ladie's veil,
 He said he had a gobbet⁷ of the seyl⁸
 Thatte seinte Peter hadde, when that he went,
 Upon the see till Jesu Christ him hent.⁹
 He had a crois of laton¹⁰ ful of stones,
 And in a glass he hadde pigges' bones.

With such "relikes" to aid him he made, the poet tells us, both parson and people his "apes." With these unworthy servants of the church is contrasted the "Good Parson," the description of whose sanctity, patience, industry, self-denial, and single-mindedness, does credit to the poet's ideal of the pastor's high vocation.

In these various characters, in the stories they relate, and in the circumstances detailed respecting them, we possess true and vivid pictures of the manners, customs, amusements, as well as

¹ Farm.² Hung.³ Ounces.⁴ Brimful.⁵ Sack.⁶ Covering of a pillow.⁷ Morsel.⁸ Sail.⁹ Assisted.¹⁰ A metallic cross.

the vices, of that dawning day of civilization. The Canterbury Tales possess a value far above their intrinsic literary merit. They present to us an epitome of English life in the fourteenth century, more truthful, probably, than can elsewhere be found in the language. Our Anglo Saxon ancestors are here marshalled into our presence just as Chaucer's minutely observant eye saw them in his time. With all their excellencies and all their faults, their social existence is here renewed; and so life-like and strongly marked is each person and each scene, that we seem for the time actually travelling with the merry company, while they pursue their journey. It is "as if Time had rebuilt his ruins and were reacting the lost scenes of existence."

In seeking for Chaucer's prominent characteristics, we recognize at once his great descriptive power. Every scene and every character lives before us. His naturalness, also, is most observable. Nothing is artificial; nature reigns supreme everywhere. He is, in fact, preëminently a poet of nature. He is the poet of spring, of the singing of the birds, of the zephyr, and the flowers. He is no weak nor lazy copyist; he takes nothing at second hand. His lines are fresh as the morning scenes he was so fond of describing, and redolent of all beauty whether of outward form or inward life. His, too, was no venal muse, for he wrote in an age when there was no temptation to such venality. He sung, as did Homer, because the deep and pent up fountains of melody within him would not be denied an utterance. And the likeness does not stop here; they both wrote in a comparatively rude age, and both stand as leaders among the poets of their respective races. Above all, they were in the highest sense original, or, we should rather say, *aboriginal*, drawing their inspiration from those pure and hidden fountains which nature reveals only to her true prophets.

And there is an antithesis in the history of poetry which we cannot forbear here to notice. Byron stands among the last, as does Chaucer among the first, of English poets. The chronological contrast is an index to that of their characters. Both were men of genius, each in his measure; but here all likeness between the two comes to an abrupt termination. It was the author of Don Juan, who spoke of Chaucer as "obscene and contemptible," and as owing all his popularity to his anti-quity. So far is this from being true, it is rather true, that whatever of grossness we find in Chaucer's plain delineations of his

times, is, like that of Shakspeare's, altogether objective; it lives in the character, not in the writer. The freedom of Byron, on the other hand, is quite the reverse; we seem to behold it welling forth from the writer's own interior life. Chaucer, as well as Byron, indulges sometimes in satire. But while the satire of Byron stalks forth with the scowl of hate upon its visage, that of Chaucer is of a certain benign aspect, intending no real harm to any one. The one smites with intent to kill; the other is but the friendly messenger sent to perform a cure. Chaucer, even in old age, preserves the fresh feeling and warm glow of youth; Byron, while yet a young man, presents a spectacle of sour and discontented age. Chaucer's great heart was full of sympathies and tenderness, gushing out and spreading over every page of his poems; Byron's was but too often the abode of grovelling passion; unhappy in itself, and spreading an atmosphere of bitterness all around. While we rejoice in what Chaucer *was*, we mourn, when we see what Byron, with his native powers, social position and culture, *might have been*.

The popularity of Chaucer has experienced various vicissitudes. In the age of Queen Elisabeth, he was truly regarded as the first of English poets; and Spenser, his fond admirer and copyist, when dying, requested, as an especial honor, to be buried near his tomb. At other periods, he has not been so generally read. Of the present time, Mr. De Quincy well says: "Chaucer's divine qualities are languidly acknowledged by his unjust countrymen." And, in his later days, we hear Coleridge saying: "I take unceasing delight in Chaucer. His manly cheerfulness is especially delicious to my old age. How exquisitely tender he is." The estimation in which he will be held in future, will of course vary with the varying opinions of successive schools in poetry. There are several hindrances to his general popularity, which later poets do not suffer. Chaucer, as we have seen, has, with the greatest fidelity, painted his times; and there was much, in that semi-barbarous age, of grossness and immorality. Many of the forms of expression, too, quite current at that period, do not tally well with modern notions of propriety. Besides, the language, and especially the orthography, of the fourteenth century, present a forbidding aspect to modern eyes. Words now wholly obsolete abound, presenting no inconsiderable obstacle to the general reader; which, it should be said, however, a few days of patient labor will mostly overcome;

and every one who does this, will, we think, be richly repaid.

Whatever the general and popular estimation of his writings may be, he will be read so long as a love for nature and truth shall remain among those who speak the English language. He was worthy to lead off that noble band of British bards, who will long reflect glory on the English name. It is a conspicuous place which he holds among his compeers in that "House of Fame," which he has so graphically described to us. And as we, who are privileged with a later look into that Temple of Renown than was he, behold him there with those who in successive ages have joined him, it is altogether a goodly number. A select few are conspicuous; Chaucer in the van, fit herald of such a noble array; the "Moral Gower," his contemporary, with a less imperial bearing; the generous Surry,

"His was the Hero's soul of fire
And his the bard's immortal name."

Edward Spenser, who sung the Fairy Queen, and for whom dying the Genius of Poetry wept, casting garlands on his grave; Shakspeare, towering preëminent in the pomp of dramatic greatness, a king in the realm of creative thought; Milton, surpassing all in the vastness of his knowledge and the splendor of his imagination, with solemn countenance, and soul rapt with inspiration of the heavenly Muse; Pope, the undisputed master of harmonious numbers; Thompson, unsurpassed in his love of rural nature, and inimitable in his descriptions of rural scenes; and Cowper, the gentle and the pious, a spirit of heaven, jarred and put out of tune, by its connection with earth, yet, in spite thereof, giving us snatches of heavenly melody. Truly is it a goodly company. The Temple of Fame enshrines their memory; their words are the inheritance of Time.

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

I. DR. CANNON'S PASTORAL THEOLOGY.¹

By Rev. C. Van Santvoord, Sangerties, N. Y.

THE office of professor in theology has about it little of that glare which attracts the notice or excites the wonder of the multitude. Compared with the popular preacher who appears week after week before a crowd, hushed and subdued by the tones of a stirring oratory, it might seem, at the first view, that the office of the former was insignificant and his work barren of results. Judged by superficial tests—and these sometimes have a surprisingly wide and potent sway—the superior importance and utility of the preacher's labors, would seem hardly to admit of a question. According to such tests, if truth is to be preserved, or its influence widened, or infidelity to be rebuked, or rationalism undermined, or "spiritual wickedness in high places" discomfited, and Gospel light conveyed to benighted minds most irresistibly, *he* is the likeliest to effect such results, whose power to move and melt is confessed by captivated crowds, loving to be charmed by accents which are to them "as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well upon an instrument."

What equal claims to honor can the professor advance? He is a quiet, unobserved man. He has his home and the arena of his labors usually "remote from cities," or, if in them, he can hardly be said to be of them. Though having exercised the functions of the preacher in years gone by, and wielded the influence of the honored pastor, he no more addresses, except occasionally and by way of digression from the tread-mill routine of every-day duty, the "great congregation," or visits from house to house, the many-hued minds which an adapted Gospel is given to guide, comfort or impress. The lecture-room, rather than the church, is the theatre whereon his skill and prowess are to be displayed. A few disciples, rather than a promiscuous gathering, constitute his stated auditory; and the subjects for the reception of lessons, whose design is to qualify fit and faithful workmen for the service of the sanctuary. Day after day, and month after month, he passes backward and forward from the house to the lecture-room with the regularity of a machine. He gathers noiselessly his little class around him. He opens to inquisitive and earnest minds treasures of sacred lore, which

¹ Lectures on Pastoral Theology, by the Rev. James S. Cannon, D. D., late Professor of Pastoral Theology and Ecclesiastical History and Government, in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Dutch Church, New Brunswick, N. J. New York: Charles Scribner, 145 Nassau Street. 1853.

long and laborious diligence has accumulated, more precious, in their effects at least, than those brought by devout Magi to the cradle of the infant Christ. He is not covetous of the applauses of the bustling crowd without, who hold on their accustomed way, heeding neither him nor his teachings. Their indifference gives him no concern. It is enough for him, to be invested with the honor, and with the responsibility not less, of guiding and instructing those, who are soon to become the guides and instructors of the people. And it matters very little to him, whether the world know his name familiarly or not, if he can but succeed in furnishing for the great battle with the enemies of Zion, those who shall valiantly and devotedly uphold the sacred cause of truth.

And thus it comes to pass not unfrequently, that a person who has long occupied such a position as this, and occupied it too most creditably and usefully, dies without having acquired any wide-spread distinction, and at his departure is followed with no general deep-drawn sigh, "how is the mighty fallen." His name, even as it appears on the list of the dead, may be coldly glanced at by the world as being almost that of a stranger. But fame is not the measure of utility. The obscure life is not the insignificant life. What has been wrought for the good of humanity, is not to be estimated by any degree of worldly distinction, or any amount of worldly adulation or applause. The truth lies deeper. The true teacher of theology is one of the great powers of this earth. He moves — what the lever of Archimedes, however favorably adjusted, never could move — human minds, dispositions, volitions, affections. The knowledge which he imparts has not been easily obtained, but is the fruit of weary and toilsome years, brought from far and near, and amassed as a common hoard, for the benefit of those who stretch forth their hands at his bidding and gather what they may. His knowledge is not all theory; has not all been gleaned from books. His own experience of the pastor's wants and trials; of his discouragements and supports; of what he should be, and what he should do, and what he must or may suffer, imparts to his teaching a practical character, which enhances its value; for the professor has, in most instances, been himself an overseer of the flock of Christ. The lessons thus given to those who are to be pastors, embody theoretical with experimental knowledge. The choicest fruits of an active and inquiring intellect, of the diligent study of the "lively oracles," of fatiguing but successful excursions into all fields where valuable sheaves were awaiting the gatherer's hand, of counsels made sagacious by intercourse with men, and life made blameless by stern discipline and trial, are brought forth, and freely offered to those who can hardly partake for months and years of such a repast, without finding health increase, and the heart grow strong for grappling with the great work which the pastor has to do.

Accordingly, if we would estimate the professor's work aright, we must cast our glance abroad over the church and over the world, and let it "enter within the soil" that hides the coming years. The young man, well instructed in the theory and practice of winning souls, goes forth to become

himself the teacher and guide of men. He goes forth like trusting Abraham, not knowing whither the Divine will shall lead him. The field is the world. The harvests are whitening around him. The laborers are few. The heavenly voice bidding him enter and reap, is decisive and urgent. He goes whither he is guided, and enters on his toils with the ardor of a volunteer, rather than the slow and lingering pace of one who undertakes reluctantly a task for which he has no relish. The effects of his careful and conscientious training soon appear. As a "man of God thoroughly furnished unto all good works," he makes his mark upon the district where he is called to labor. He wields, in spite of every hostile array, the influence which is well-nigh inseparable from educated, well-directed and devoted piety everywhere. The church is edified, strengthened, expanded; vice and irreligion, though entrenched behind power, are made to tremble, as Felix did, at the winged "words of truth and soberness;" error and delusion vanish before the sword of the Lord as brandished by His accredited and loyal ambassador, and from the little circle within which a single standard-bearer has planted his foot and displayed his banner, inscribed with "Christ and him crucified," an influence, as benign and purifying as it is gentle, is conveyed to surrounding minds and habitations, and through these still more remotely abroad, so that the entire measure of the good achieved baffles the power of present calculation. Or, if the Macedonian cry "come over and help us," has given the energies of the devoted soldier another direction, and he goes forth to win trophies for his Lord on the foreign field, there, too, his works attest his zeal and heroism. The wilderness and solitary place are made glad by his presence; the desert rejoices and blossoms as the rose. The heart of the church is cheered, perchance, by tidings wafted from beyond the sea, of temples, whose altars smoked with the blood of human victims, supplanted by those which Jehovah's praises and presence fill, and from the myriads of a pagan world many devout worshippers "turned to God from idols, to serve henceforth the living and true God."

Such results may be wrought through God's guiding and aiding Spirit, by a single well-disciplined mind, whose powers have been trained and consecrated in some school of the prophets. These are among the fruits of those lessons given in the lecture-room; lessons, unregarded by the throng of bustling men, daily repeated without noise or display; wearisome at times to the teacher, from their monotony; to the careless observer, utterly unpromising. But in God's time the harvest has succeeded the seed season, and the multitude of garnered sheaves will never be fully known to us, till the great day come whereon "the Lord shall count when He writeth up the people that this and that man was born there." What surprising revelations await "the pure in heart who shall see God," and rejoice that they no longer "see through a glass darkly."

The author of the book before us, illustrates to some extent the idea designed to be conveyed by the foregoing paragraphs. He became a teacher of theology in the full maturity of his powers, having served for thirty years previously, in the work of the ministry. During all this period, he continued

the pastor of the same congregation, thus furnishing an example of the "steadfast and unmovable," which, in this day of comparative instability, it is quite refreshing to see. He discharged the duties of his pastorate, laboriously, faithfully, unblamably and usefully, and, with the ripe experience of so many years, passed into the professor's chair, to which the confidence of the church he belonged to, had elected him. The change occurred in 1826, from which period till his death in 1852, he performed, in a faithful and exemplary manner, the duties which his office demanded, giving instruction not only to the classes in the Theological School, but also to those in the Literary Institution, connected with it. The Seminary with which his name is honorably and now indissolubly connected, belongs to a church, which, though among the smallest of the denominational families that compose our American Israel, is yet venerable for its age and associations, estimable for the unbending firmness with which it has held fast to the great doctrines of the Reformation, and exemplary for its exemption from those internal feuds and collisions, by which other sections of the Christian church have been distracted and torn. And, if somewhat deficient hitherto, in that aggressive and enterprising spirit, which has served to extend other denominations more widely and rapidly, yet evincing ever a liberal, earnest and catholic disposition, to cooperate with all true Christian hearts, in sustaining and carrying forward those good and great enterprises, which owe their birth and vigor equally to the gift and genius of our common Christianity.

Dr. Cannon was connected with this Seminary more than a quarter of a century. During this period, a succession of thoroughly educated young preachers have gone forth into the world; some to exercise their gifts within the bounds of their own church, at home; some to prove the skill and excellence of their preparatory training, within the pale of sister denominations; others to break ground for themselves and build, with Christ to help them, on no other man's foundation, amid the prairies and wildernesses of the far western country, and a few, of whom the lamented Abiel was the pioneer, to sow the seed of the Word on soil moistened and fattened by the blood of human sacrifices. What good has been achieved by the consecrated energies of all these educated minds, brought thus in contact with a "world which by wisdom knows not God," and how far the influence of one faithful and pains-taking professor, not widely known to fame, has contributed to produce the united result, whatever that result may be, it is of course impossible to say. The aggregate of fruits, shall only be seen when, "in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming," the "crowns of rejoicing" shall appear, and the world witness the spectacle.

The lectures which form this volume are thirty-six in number, the result of the diligent years during which the author held the responsible position of professor, the matters treated in them having been all along subject to such improvements as his taste and judgment might suggest. A glance through the pages of the book will show how wide and comprehensive is the range of topics discussed, and that they who undervalue the importance of this branch of theology as compared with other branches, might find it hard

to rest their preference on good and substantial grounds. In fact, among the subjects treated are some of the gravest and most important character, which, no workman who would not be ashamed, can venture to slight or disparage. The portion of the volume which exhibits the graces of the Divine life, the fruits of piety, whose earnest cultivation is essential, not only to the pastor's growing usefulness, but to his personal comfort in the trying work which has received his consecration, is one of high interest and value. There is the subject of prayer — public, private, social — treated with great fullness and force; its importance and its qualifications shown; the argument in behalf of extemporary prayer clearly stated; the argument against the exclusive use of liturgical forms pungently put; how the grace and gift of prayer may be improved; how they may be made to dwindle, and in what should consist the matter, order and manner of those prayers in the sanctuary, by means of which the pastor conducts the devotions of his flock. There are also discussed the Christian sacraments, as compared with those of the past dispensation; their nature, design, extent and efficacy explained; who are the proper subjects to receive the benefits of these significant rites; the difference between John's baptism and that of Christ; the corruptions engrafted on these simple ordinances by the Romish church, and other hardly less scrupulous sects. These topics, together with those which refer directly to what is requisite to prepare the pastor to preach the Gospel most effectively, are all treated in a style of argument both clear and cogent, and with a copiousness which leaves little ground for the charge that they have received at the lecturer's hands no more than a hasty and superficial survey.

The lectures are marked by clearness and discrimination. The "large sound roundabout sense," as Mr. Locke calls it, which every page discloses, forms a very observable feature. The lecturer's well-poised judgment never betrays him into sentimental improprieties, and rarely suffers his expression to relax into a tone unbecoming the gravity of the subjects discussed. He appears throughout to estimate profoundly the worth and dignity of the ministerial office, and to desire heartily that his own convictions should fix themselves in the minds of his pupils. So great is his earnestness in this respect, that the didactic style is occasionally merged and lost in the hortatory, and the transition, instead of offending, rather gives us pleasure, as revealing the workings of a warm heart intent on reaching the heart as well as the understanding of the neophyte. A tone of deeply pious feeling pervades the lectures, rising at times, in the closing parts, which are occupied with practical reflections, into a style of remark impressively devout. The high place which "the law and testimony" held in the lecturer's mind, and the degree to which his mind was imbued both with its sentiments and language, everywhere appear. Expressions occur not unfrequently, distinctly pointing to the copious well-spring whence the thought was drawn, almost insensibly to the writer perchance, while literal Scriptural passages illustrating his idea, are interwoven through his pages, selected with his usual judgment, and often very happily introduced. To illustrate these

views by apposite quotations, would be to transcribe very largely from the volume.

The author has little fondness for abstract speculation. He nowhere launches forth upon a sea of conceits where "fathom-line can never reach the ground." He conducts his pupils or his readers to no position where the ground beneath them is tremulous and liable to slide. He has not learned to admire the German mysticism of thought, nor to affect the outlandish jargon, which Carlyle has helped to make popular, by which true thought is so greatly impaired, and the poverty of thought sought to be concealed. He cannot trifle with his trust, nor with the interests of those who are looking to him for guidance, by pausing to plume his wings for a flight whither others cannot follow him, or by stepping aside to cull strange flowers of speech, which may regale the sense, but not strengthen the heart. He treats his subject with manly dignity and directness, and himself illustrates the following remarks upon the dignity of the pulpit, which, with a certain class of preachers of the present day, seems to have become, if not quite an "obsolete idea," yet a rule regarded as more honored in the breach than in the observance:

"Especially is dignity in the pulpit opposed to all pert, quaint and witty expressions. Displays of wit are out of place in the sacred desk; for, in proportion as wit excites our admiration of certain associations of ideas in men of wit, it stirs up those emotions which are more allied to merriment than devotion, and which divert our attention from the sublime realities of religion. Hardly should a good religious anecdote be introduced into a sermon, if with all the instruction it may afford it contain much wit, and is calculated to make some hearers smile and others laugh. To use the language of Seneca: "*Quid mihi lusoria ista proponis? Non est jocundi locus.*" . . . "Religion abhors the ridiculous and the witty in the pulpit as bordering too much on levity. The thoughtless in public worship may be amused by remarks which inflict pain on the hearts of the pious."¹ pp. 160, 161.

¹ In Rev. Dr. Bethune's Oration before the Theological classes at Andover in 1842, one of the most instructive and admirable that any similar occasion has called forth, the following remarks in the same line with the above occur, and may be fittingly introduced in this connection: "There is no force nor wit in slang or cant expressions; or, if they excite attention for the moment, it is at the expense of the house of God, the ministry, and the Gospel itself, by pandering to a low taste, and investing sacred things with ludicrous and grovelling associations. The man who plays the buffoon or the clown in the pulpit, leaves not that sacred place what he found it. However dignified the preacher may be that follows him, the people cannot look up to listen and forget the tricks that were played where he stands; vulgar pruriency will long for the gross excitement, and the refined cannot wholly discharge the sickening images from their thoughts. Let once the boisterous laugh ring round a place of worship, and its echoes will disturb the meditations of the pious for many a long day." This is well and truly said, and, we will add by way of commentary, that the effect of the "boisterous laugh" in God's house, is much the same, whether "the clown in the

Throughout these lectures the reader is never suffered to lose sight of the lofty aim, the thoroughly earnest purpose controlling the mind and heart that gave them being and maturity; and it is rare that there is any seeming departure in the language from that dignified seriousness which is the most fitting expression of such an aim and purpose. Yet occasionally we come upon a sly satirical hit, a touch of quiet and quaint humor, reminding us of the droll strokes of artless old Izaak Walton, or the more attic sallies of honest Thomas Fuller in his Church History of Britain. A passage or two may be cited as a sample:

"Perhaps the greatest pulpit orators are not so useful in communicating solid instruction, as those who, without oratorical powers, enrich their sermons with deep thought, with heart-searching and practical divinity; nor are those persons who on the Sabbath are seen to be in chase of popular preachers, found to have furnished their minds with a large measure of Scriptural knowledge. Great will be the mistake of such persons if they suppose that they are to be lifted up to heaven by *their ears*." p. 145.

Indiscriminate reading of books without due reflection is characterized thus:

"Father Augustine long since said: '*lectio inquiri, oratio postulat, meditatio invenit, contemplatio degustat.*' Some young men in the ministry exhibit a voracious appetite in reading books, but there is no digestion by them of what they read. When they take up their pens to compose sermons, they are obliged to borrow without ceremony from the writers before them too lavishly. It is an unhappy condition in natural life to *live by borrowing*." p. 150.

Again:

"A preacher pays but a poor compliment to the understanding of his hearers, and to the Bible itself, when he draws out of it (and he might just as well have taken it out of an *almanac*) the single word '*remember*,' in order to publish his philosophical theories respecting the powers of memory and its indestructible tenacity." p. 175.

"It is much to be regretted, that so many of our youth, after passing through the forms of an academical education, think that they are elevated above the study of English grammar, and need no longer consult their dictionaries." . . . "Some enter the ministry too wise in their own conceit to learn the art of speaking and writing with propriety, the language in which they are to preach the Gospel." p. 155.

Such quiet strokes as these occur where and when the reader least looks for them, and have upon him the effect of provoking a pleasant surprise, without, however, suggesting the idea of unseemly incongruity, or forcing him to feel that they detract seriously from the dignified tone which is for the most

pulpit" or the refined man of wit occasion it. The merriment is equally unseasonable and indecorous, and the difference, if there be any, is one of degree and association alone.

part well preserved. They seem to have come spontaneously, without being sought for, and are uniformly used, not for effect, but for illustration.

The author of these lectures was an edifying and effective preacher to the close of his long life. His habit was to commit his written preparations to a memory of great tenacity, and strengthened by long practice, so that in delivery his words seemed to flow as naturally and with as little labor of memory as in the most fluent extemporary discourse. This, besides investing his instructions on this subject with the additional value derived from his own successful experience, may explain the *penchant* he discovers in his lectures for *memoriter* preaching, or, at least, preaching without the written sermon before the preacher's eyes. He states, not so fully as he might have stated, some of the arguments usually assigned in behalf of manuscript preaching, and then argues, at considerable length, his own side of the question, as we may term it, that is, adversely to the use of the written sermon in the pulpit. Want of room forbids the quotation of his remarks on this question, judicious as many of them are, and forbids, also, any extended reflection that might be made in modification of one or two of the lecturer's views on this mooted subject. We will merely say, that a discourse from the pulpit is a very different affair, in its character not less than in its attendant circumstances, from the plea which the advocate makes in bar, or the speech which the political haranguer utters at the hustings. The advocate's staple consists largely of facts, the product of testimony; the stump-orator's appeals are based, too, upon facts, or what he may consider such, growing out of the state of parties or of the country; facts, not only perfectly familiar to his hearers, but having for them a present and, perhaps, a pressing interest. The successive pleas or speeches made, present to the listener's attention classes of facts differing from those previously commented on, and invest the subjects or cases treated with the attractive freshness of novelty. The speeches, besides, are neither spoken periodically nor very often, but only on emergent occasions, and usually to different audiences. The character of the audience is, moreover, very often such, that a more careless style of expression, a more unconstrained and bolder declamation, with a more homely and even coarser imagery than would be tolerated in the pulpit, instead of offending the taste, really prove quite palatable and show themselves highly effective in moving minds that would be impatient of a more staid, precise and elaborate style of oratory.

It is different with the preacher. He addresses a graver assembly, on far graver subjects, and on the most solemn of days. The great topics that he discourses upon, are those which the apostles discoursed upon from the beginning, and all true successors of theirs have discoursed upon subsequently. He must substitute in his discourses, in no small measure, faith for sight, the distant for the present, the impalpable for the tangible, the eternal for the temporal. The didactic method which many of his weighty subjects demand, has small affinity to that rough, racy and sometimes improptu speech that best suits and moves a promiscuous multitude. He has to observe the decorums of time, place and circumstance. He cannot indulge in a loose style

of declamation, or clothe his thoughts in too plain a garb, or draw his illustrations from too common sources, or give free rein to his fancy, without sinking the dignity of the pulpit, and giving a shock to the graver part of his audience. The periodical frequency, too, with which the preacher appears before the same audience, who would soon weary of monotony, were not his discourses made freshly various and interesting, instead of presenting, from week to week, a jejune repetition of common-place topics, varied only in arrangement, a fault which extemporary speakers are prone to run into, demands that studied and careful preparation which can rarely be made so well, that is, so continuously well, if the preacher fails to write out what he designs for the weekly edification of his flock.

These points of difference may serve to show why, in the preacher's case, a written preparation for the pulpit, as a general rule, cannot be safely dispensed with. In fact, the duty of writing carefully is nowhere enjoined more emphatically, than in the lectures before us. But, granting this, it may still be urged, "why should not the preacher commit to memory what he has written, and banish the manuscript from the pulpit altogether?" Because, it may be replied: 1. Many preachers have not powers of memory adequate to commit, steadily and accurately, the discourses they prepare. 2. Discourses imperfectly committed are apt to render the manner timid and embarrassed, from the perpetual effort of the mind to call up the appropriate words, and thus sensibly impair the power of the spoken sermon. 3. Many, though able to commit, feel an unconquerable repugnance to an habitual exercise, which, while denying its necessity or superior excellence, they regard as belonging more properly to the elementary schools. 4. The outlay of time and toil in writing sermons, is quite as great as can be spared from other pressing duties which demand the pastor's attention, without imposing upon him the additional and often more exhausting burden of committing them to memory. 5. A sermon preached from notes may, with proper care, and without this no man should undertake to *preach* it, be delivered quite as effectively, with as appropriate emphasis and action, and with the preacher's eye, too, as well able to scan and control his audience, as though it were uttered from memory. An appeal to the practice of many of the ablest and most effective preachers, of our own and of other times, would go far to establish this averment. Of course, to be chained down to a hieroglyphical manuscript, which requires more ingenuity to decipher than to have composed, is not the most favorable condition for producing oratorical effects; but then, speaking thus fettered will not be miscalled *preaching*, by any save the "blissful ignorant," to whom all kinds of pulpit utterance are alike. Without extending the subject, we will give our author's summing up of his argument on the general question, from the tenor of which we should not feel seriously inclined to dissent:

"What, then, must be the conclusion of the matter, so far as students of theology are concerned? It is obviously this: 1. They should aim in the course of their education both to read and speak sermons well. The best speaker may,

through the loss of memory, or the want of time to commit his sermon, find it necessary to fall back upon his notes and read them; then the art of reading becomes a valuable acquisition. So the best reader may be placed in circumstances which require him to speak without notes; how useful, then, will be his speaking talent. He will not be silent but do the best he can, for he is not a bound slave to his manuscript. Let, then, both the gift of reading and the accomplishment of speaking be cultivated in a theological school. 2. Every theological student should seriously examine into his natural and acquired gifts, and try to ascertain whether these gifts fit him to be a better reader than a speaker of sermons, or *vice versa*. Some, through indolence, will give the preference to reading, though they read ill; others, from love of praise, will play the orator, when they should adhere to their manuscripts. That mode of delivery should be adopted by the preacher which corresponds best with his gifts, and this he should pursue." p. 231.

A similar line of remark is pursued by Dr. Vinet, in his work on Pastoral Theology, recently presented to the American reader by his accomplished translator, Rev. Dr. Skinner. Extemporaneous preaching, except where it is unavoidable, he disallows absolutely. He is for having the *young* preacher write and recite, but to give ideas the preference to words in the memory, and in all cases to prepare well and solidly. His observations are pertinent and striking, and well deserve to be weighed. And, since we have introduced the name of the late well-known professor at Lausanne, we cannot dismiss him or his work without a passing remark. His "Pastoral Theology" is, in many respects, worthy of his distinguished reputation, and deserves to be considered as a valuable contribution to our theological literature. It bears, like "Gospel Studies," "Separation of Church from the State," and other works from the same hand, the characteristic marks of a mind of great power and fertility. It breathes a tone deeply evangelical. It displays a happy facility both in analysis and arrangement. It is marked, in parts at least, by a spirit genuinely philosophic. Its thoughts have an air of originality, while the expression is characterized by a certain picturesque terseness and vivacity, which greatly heighten its effect. It is less enigmatically metaphysical than parts of the "Gospel Studies," and, though compactly written, is seldom obscure. The following passage, however, will perhaps hardly justify the translator's encomium on the "beautiful simplicity" of his author's language:

"The true form of a sermon is composed of the double impression of the subject, and of the subjectivity of the orator. The form of a sermon acknowledges only these two laws, which, so far from opposing, combine with one another.

"As to the general forms which we may observe among preachers, as the psychological and logical form, that of continuous discourse, and that of parallel developments, or of discourse ramified, the analytical and synthetical sermon, they are neither conventional nor artificial; they are less differences of form than of thought, points of view, methods of conceiving the subject of discourse. They exist in the subjects themselves, and in the human mind, anterior to all tradition.

"There is the same difference between the conventional and spontaneous form, as there is between the two physiological systems, one of which makes the

prominences of the skull to depend on the internal developments of the brain, and the other, these same developments to depend on the prominences of the skull; one expressing the internal by the external, the other, by the external compressing and determining the internal; one, subordinating the external to the internal, the other, the internal to the external. We ourselves prefer, that the external should spring from the internal, and in respect to form, we give no rule but this." pp. 215, 216.

There are not many passages, however, like the above, whose precise idea, words either conceal, or force us to look at, as it were "through a glass darkly." On the more practical subjects, the author is sufficiently direct and clear; his simplicity is often very engaging. A considerable portion of the volume is occupied with subjects of this description, forbidding from their very nature, those metaphysical excursions toward which the author's mind had a strong bias. His book furnishes, in some respects, a lively contrast to that of Dr. Cannon. He has a more vivid imagination, an easier flow of words, a more racy style of expression, greater copiousness of illustration, and more picturesqueness in the presentation of a thought. He has surveyed some topics which Dr. Cannon has wholly passed by, to the serious detriment of the completeness of his work. Among these may be instanced the subject of the minister's domestic life, embracing his "house and household economy," the "government of his family," and the subjects of "the choice of a parish" and "ministerial changes," with some others included within the chapter on "Worship." Several of these topics are too interesting and belong too intimately to the experiences and duties of a pastor, not to deserve a prominent place in treatises of this character. On those points, too, which are discussed by both writers, it is striking to observe the different forms of expression given by them respectively to similar ideas, and how the matter described has more or less distinctness, proportion and body, as presented to us from this or that position, or through the medium of this or the other mind.

On some topics which we should have expected Dr. Vinet to treat copiously, he is meagre and unsatisfactory enough. The subject of prayer, so fully and luminously surveyed by Dr. Cannon, and obviously involving the highest interests of both pastor and people, has, in the transmarine treatise, hardly the cold respect of a passing glance devoted to its character and claims. The comprehensive and deeply interesting subject of the sacraments, to which, with their cognate questions, Dr. Cannon devotes not less than fifteen lectures, is almost wholly omitted by Dr. Vinet, for the reason, we suppose, that the subject was regarded by him as ranging appropriately under some other department of theology. There are, moreover, some matters introduced of a character more congenial to a transatlantic atmosphere than to our own, while, upon the questions of liturgies and the perpetuity of the Sabbath obligation, the translator has not thought proper to suffer the author's views to stand unchallenged, and has accordingly expressed his dissent from them in the appendix to the volume.

These reasons among others dispose us to give the preference, both as a class-book and one for ordinary readers, to the lectures of the American professor. They form a book which combines, in our judgment, more fully than the other, the qualities which a treatise of the kind ought to possess, and better adapt it for the use and profit of the young men among us, who are preparing to enter on the responsible work of the Christian ministry. Its entire freedom from anything speculative or misty, its thoroughly practical character, the sterling good sense and judgment which pervade it, the lofty tone of its moral inculcations, its admirable arrangement, its large and catholic spirit, its homogeneity to the liberal institutions whose spirit is reflected by the American church, with a style, which, if not brilliant, is yet dignified, expressive and forcible, all bid us esteem it very highly, and through it, its departed author, "for his work's sake." It well deserves a favored place in the theological class, and in the Christian family, where it could hardly be perused with thoughtful attention without affording a pleasant and strengthening repast.

We have but a single word to add. The lines which we have traced, have had for us a deeper interest than they can have, peradventure, for the ordinary reader. They have served to revive associations at once pensive and pleasant. We have seemed to sit once more at the feet of an honored instructor, and listen, as in days gone by, to lessons imparted in faith, hope and love, but too negligently received, alas! as the living voice conveyed them. We have looked again upon the manly form, blending dignity with grace, upon each well-remembered lineament of a countenance which petulance and passion could not ruffle, while we have seemed to hear the calm, earnest tones of a voice, wont to utter many a sage counsel besides those preserved by the printed page. It would be strange, if soothing and grateful sentiments should be divorced from such recollections, or fail to impart a tone of kindliness to the terms in which we have spoken of the departed teacher and his work. Knowing very well how prone the feelings are to bias the judgment, we find little trouble in conceiving that what has seemed greatly commendable to us may be less decidedly so to others. We feel, notwithstanding, strong confidence that when the perfectly sober verdict shall have come, with no partialities of any kind to warp it, it will prove to be not less favorable to the piety and diligence of the author, than to the enduring merits of his book.

ARTICLE IX.

SELECT THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GREAT BRITAIN.

THE cause of sacred literature, and of religion generally, has sustained a great loss in the death of the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw of Glasgow, which took place on the seventeenth of December last. Dr. W. had nearly completed his seventy-fourth year, and had been for more than fifty years pastor of the church assembling in George Street Chapel, Glasgow. He and the church commenced their career together, the day of his ordination being also the date of the formation of the church. He also occupied the office of Professor of Systematic Theology in the Institution for the educating of preachers in connection with the Congregationalists of Scotland. His publications, which were chiefly theological, and for the most part of a polemical character, were numerous, and were highly esteemed for their solidity, perspicacity and logical acuteness. His principal published works are his Discourses on the Socinian Controversy, his Christian Ethics, his Commentary on Ecclesiastes, his Treatises on the Atonement, and his Essay on Miracles. He has left behind him a large amount of valuable manuscript, some of which, especially his Theological Lectures, a Commentary on Proverbs, and an unfinished Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, on which he had bestowed much labor, and which occupied his latest efforts, will, it is hoped, see the light. A memoir of him is in course of preparation by Dr. Alexander of Edinburgh, whose funeral sermon for him has already appeared, along with those of Dr. John Brown of Edinburgh, and the Rev. Norman Macleod, one of the Established ministers of Glasgow. His funeral was attended by the clergy of all denominations; by the Lord Provost and Magistrates of the city, and several hundreds of the citizens, who sought in this way to show their respect for one who had so long and so honorably sustained the ministerial office among them.

Sir William Hamilton's forthcoming edition of the Works of Dugald Stewart is to form nine volumes, octavo, and is to include all that was published by Mr. Stewart during his lifetime, with large additions from his unpublished papers, and a life of him by the editor. In the latter we may expect to receive not only a full and discriminating account of Mr. Stewart's history and merits as a philosopher and a teacher of philosophy, but an enlightened estimate of the services rendered to philosophy by the Scottish School, of which Mr. Stewart was one of the ablest expositors, and of which Sir William Hamilton is the living representative and chief.

An Address has been published delivered by Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton before the associated societies of the University of Edinburgh, on the occasion of his installation as their Honorary President. This address was not deliv-

ered in the university, but in one of the public halls of the city, and in the presence of a most brilliant assembly of both sexes, convened by special invitation, and in full evening costume. It is a masterly production. Those who knew Sir Edward only as a poet and a novelist, were not at all prepared for the large and profound views of literature, philosophy and mental discipline with which the address abounds. It was delivered entirely from memory, not a single note being before the speaker; a circumstance not the least remarkable in the case when the peculiar nature of the address is taken into consideration.

Mr. Alexander Smith, who has recently risen into notice, as one of the freshest and most promising of youthful poets, has just been appointed Secretary to the University of Edinburgh. His principal rival in the competition for this post was Mr. Robert Young, who has distinguished himself for his attainments in Semitic literature. He is a bookseller in Edinburgh, and has a press of his own, at which he prints Hebrew, Syriac, and other oriental works. He recently put forth a translation of the Shorter Catechism into Syriac, composed and printed by his own hand, and published by himself. He is almost self-taught; and, as he is still young, it may be expected that with such devotedness to Semitic literature, such ability for linguistic pursuits, and such rare energy and perseverance as he has shown, he may yet do something considerable in this department of learning. Many, who admire Mr. Smith's poetry, have yet felt regret that, in an *Academic* appointment, Mr. Young was not allowed to possess the superior claim. But the patrons, unfortunately, are chiefly shopkeepers, and poetry *sells* better than Hebrew or Syriac literature, which is all they understand in the matter.

A small volume has appeared entitled "The Basis of Moral Science: Six Essays on Virtue, Conscience and Freedom. By Alexander Colston." These Essays are interesting as the productions of a youth of singular promise, prematurely cut off in the very opening of his career; but they are chiefly valuable as giving a clear and able view of the doctrines taught on the subjects treated by Professor Wilson, the late occupant of the Ethical Chair in the Edinburgh University. The book contains on the whole, perhaps, the ablest exposition and defence of the Utilitarian Theory of Morals (or, to use the more correct designation suggested by Kant, the *Eudaimonistic Theory*), which has recently appeared. As there is no probability of Professor Wilson ever giving his own statement of his Ethical Theory to the world, it is worth while to have the opinions of so original and vigorous a thinker communicated through the clear medium of an admiring and admired pupil.

Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh have commenced a new series of their Continental Library with a translation of the first volume of a new edition of Hengstenberg's Christology. This new edition has received the careful revision of the author, and is, indeed, almost an entirely new work. The translation is by the Rev. Theodore Meyer, formerly a pupil of Hengstenberg, and at present resident in Edinburgh; it is executed with great ability.

A new serial entitled "The Christian Cyclopaedia by the Rev. James Gardiner, M. D. and A. M.," has just been commenced. It is intended to

fill a volume of 900 pages, imperial octavo, with double columns, and to cost fifteen shillings when complete. It is popular in its character, but seems carefully prepared, and will prove a useful help to the study of Scripture.

A Life of Sir Isaac Newton is announced as soon to appear from the pen of Sir David Brewster. This is not a remodelling of the Life of Newton, published by the same author some years ago, but an entirely new work, based upon important documents recently brought to light.

A Translation of the Letters of Calvin, as collected by Dr. Jules Bonnet, with his Introduction and Historical Notes, is announced as about to appear from the press of Mr. Constable of Edinburgh. This work will fill four volumes octavo.

A Translation of Count Agénon de Gasparin's ingenious and eloquent volume, entitled "The School of Doubt and the School of Faith," has appeared.

Considerable interest has recently been awakened in Scotland, and especially in Edinburgh, on the subject of modern Greek literature. Professor Blackie of Edinburgh University, who has been spending the summer at Athens, opened his class this winter with an oration on this subject, in which he strongly advocated the study of the language and literature of Modern Greece. Making some abatement for the Professor's native "*perseverandum ingenium*," the discourse, which has been published, is full of valuable facts and conclusive reasonings. A native Greek has accompanied him to Edinburgh, and proposes to open a class for the teaching of his own language. A modern Greek Grammar has also been published by Mr. Donaldson, Greek Tutor in the University. It is carefully compiled from the best authorities, and presents, within a limited space, all that is necessary to enable one who has learned ancient Greek, to enter upon the study of its modern representative. Both Mr. Blackie and Mr. Donaldson contend that this study will be found of great advantage to the philological interpretation of the New Testament.

Professor Pillans has published "Elements of Physical and Classical Geography; comprising the geography of the ancient world in so far as it is subservient to the understanding of the Classics." This is an improved edition of the venerable Professor's Class-book of Ancient Geography.

Mr. Nichol, a spirited publisher in Edinburgh, has commenced a new edition of the Popular Poets and Poetry of Britain, edited with Biographical and Critical Notices by the Rev. George Gilfillan. The work is published in a very attractive form, in demy octavo, on superfine paper. It is sold to subscribers, who, for the payment of one guinea per annum, receive six volumes, each of which contains on an average 350 pages. This is undoubtedly one of the most remarkable achievements in the department of cheap literature yet realized. D. Appleton & Co. are publishing this edition in this country.

The new edition, the eighth, of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, commenced this year, advances steadily, and promises to be in every respect an improvement even upon its predecessor. Four volumes are now published. The

new articles' of most interest in the volumes which have yet appeared, are Whateley's Dissertation on the Rise, Progress, and Corruptions of Christianity; Agriculture, by Mr. Wilson; Agricultural Chemistry, by Dr. Anderson, Chemist to the Highland Society of Scotland; Atterbury, by Macaulay; besides many minor articles. All the old articles have been carefully revised, and brought up to the present state of science and discovery.

A Translation of the "Historical Development of Speculative Philosophy" of Chalybäus, by the Rev. A. Edersheim of Aberdeen, with a Recommenda-tory Preface by Hamilton, has just appeared. A new translation of the same work is nearly ready for publication at Andover by W. F. Draper and Brother.

Professor Forbes has followed up his well-known "Travels through the Alps of Savoy," with a volume on "Norway and its Glaciers." Mr. Forbes is also engaged in preparing a Dissertation for the Encyclopaedia Britan-nica, on the Progress of Science, in continuation of those of Playfair and Leslie.

Rev. R. C. Trench, author of "Study of Words," etc., is preparing Syno-nyms of the Greek Testament.

The Rev. P. Fairbairn, Theological Professor of the Free Church at Aberdeen, has published a second edition of his "Typology of Scripture viewed in connection with the whole series of the Divine Dispensations."

A new and carefully revised edition of Kitto's Biblical Cyclopaedia has just appeared.

In religious biography, the cheap edition of the Life of Dr. Chalmers, in weekly numbers, at three half-pence each, may be mentioned; it is com-manding a very extensive sale.

"Missionary and Ministerial Life in the Highlands: being the Memoir of the Reverend John Campbell, late Pastor of the Congregational Church, Oban," is a plain but interesting narration of the life and labors of one who belonged to a class of men raised up and singularly honored of God to do a great work in the Highlands of Scotland.

A new Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology has just been commenced at Cambridge. In the range of subjects will be embraced "not only the criticism of language, but every topic connected with the Literature and History of Antiquity." So far as it relates to Sacred Philology, its aim is not merely to illustrate single passages of the Bible, but to promote "the methodical study of its several books and their history." The work is to be conducted by a committee of resident members of the University of Cam-bridge, though it is designed "to make it as little exclusive or local as possi-ble." Contributions are accordingly solicited from all quarters. Messrs. W. F. Draper and Brother of Andover, Mass. are the agents, of whom the first number may now be had.

Several Notices of New Publications, and much of the Literary Intelligence, prepared for this number, are necessarily omitted, on account of the unexpected length of one or two of the Articles.

CONTENTS OF NO. XLIII.

Article.	Page.
I. EXCURSION FROM DAMASCUS TO YABRUD, ETC., By Rev. J. L. Porter, Missionary at Damascus.	433
II. DRUIDISM, By Rev. Edward D. Morris, Auburn, N. Y.	456
III. CASTE IN THE ISLAND OF CEYLON, By Rev. Benjamin C. Meigs, Rev. Daniel Poor, D. D., and Rev. William W. Holland, Missionaries of the A. B. C. F. M. in Ceylon.	470
IV. CHRISTIAN CHARACTER A POWER IN THE REDEMPTION OF THE WORLD, By Austin Phelps, Professor at Andover.	490
V. DID PAUL MODEL HIS LANGUAGE AFTER THAT OF DEMOSTHENES? Translated from the German of Dr. Friedrich Köster of Städe.	514
VI. THE GENIUS OF HEBREW AND OF ROMAN LEARNING, 527 By P. B. Spear, Professor of the Hebrew and Latin Languages, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y. I. Hebrew and Roman Learning treated Comparatively with the Greek, II. Hebrew and Roman Learning treated Comparatively with each other,	528 547

VII. THE CITATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW, 568

Translated from the German of Tholuck, by Charles A. Aiken, Resident
Licentiate, Andover.

§ 1. Historical Introduction,	569
§ 2. The Citations of the Old Testament in Jewish Authors,	577
§ 3. Application of the Old Testament in the Discourses of Christ,	586
§ 4. The Application of the Old Testament by Paul,	594
§ 5. Application of the Old Testament by the Evangelists,	600
§ 6. Application of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews,	606

VIII. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS, 616

I. Septem contra Thebas,	616
II. Ebrard on Hebrews, in continuation of Olshausen,	624
III. Alexander's Connection of the Old and New Testaments,	626
IV. Alexander's Christ and Christianity,	628
V. Barnes on Daniel,	629
VI. Professor Eadie on the Ephesians,	630
VII. Christ as made known to the Ancient Church,	631
VIII. Coleman's Historical Text-book and Atlas of Biblical Geography,	633
IX. Hughes's Outlines of Scripture Geography and History,	634
X. Chalybäus's History of Philosophy,	635
XI. Schmitz's Advanced Latin Exercises,	636

IX. SELECT THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE, 637

Greece,	637
Germany,	640
Great Britain,	643

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA,
NO. XLIII
AND
AMERICAN BIBLICAL REPOSITORY,
NO. XCV.

JULY, 1854.

ARTICLE I.

EXCURSION FROM DAMASCUS TO YABRŪD, ETC.

By Rev. J. L. Porter, Missionary at Damascus.

IN attempting to explore the eastern part of Syria, which has hitherto scarcely been entered upon by the geographer, I have pursued a regular plan. I marked out a series of excursions in different directions, to be undertaken when circumstances would permit, or a regard to health required a short respite from more severe studies. My object has been threefold: first, to become acquainted with the state and character of the people; second, to note the topography, physical features, and antiquities of the country; and third, to make such surveys as would enable me to construct a map.

My plan, laid down some two years ago, is now nearly completed as far as regards the "Environs of Damascus." The Wady of the Barada and the route by Neby Shit to Ba'albek were first examined. Then the valleys of Helbôn and Menin, with the mountain-chains and groups near them. After this, I went to the summit of Jebel esh-Sheikh, and glanced at the southern section of Antilebanon, the sources of the river A'waj, and the western parts of the plain of Damascus. The substance of my observations upon all these has been already communicated to you.

My next journey was to Saidanâya and Yabrûd, returning by the Aleppo road to Kutaifeh, and then crossing the mountains to Maksûra in the eastern plain, on the borders of the desert; and thence to Damascus. No part of this route has ever been accurately described, so far as I know; and the latter part of it has never been traversed by Frank travellers. During this excursion I was enabled to explore the central-eastern section of Anti-lebanon, and the north-eastern division of the plain of Damascus. I afterwards proceeded to the lakes east of Damascus, all of which I carefully surveyed, taking bearings from different points. The central and eastern portions of the plain here occupied my attention, with the lower part of the river A'waj. My last ride was to the summit of the lofty conical peak on the south bank of the A'waj, called Tell Mânî'a. This is a conspicuous object, and commands a fine view over the surrounding country.

Two other much longer journeys which I made have also afforded me additional opportunities of ascertaining the leading features of the Environs of Damascus. The first was to Palmyra, more than two years ago; the other to the Haurân in January, 1853. In the latter, I went by the eastern end of the ranges of Jebel el-Aswad and Jebel Mânî'a, and across the plain to Burâk on the north-east corner of the Lejah. Thence I travelled along the east side of the Lejah southward to the mountainous region called *Ard el-Bethenyeh*. I returned by the western border of the Lejah, Deir 'Aly, and Kesweh.

The present Article contains my notes on the Excursion to Saidanâya, Yabrûd, and Maksûra.

October 19th, 1852. Our little party, consisting of Mr. Robson, Mr. Barnett, myself, and one servant, assembled this morning at daybreak; and were soon after on horseback. The streets were still in a great measure deserted as we rode along; and the rickety-looking doors and shutters of the little shops did not improve the appearance of the narrow and crooked streets. They are miserable enough, even when the choicest wares and the richest fruits are displayed, and animated groups fill almost every spot. But then there is a picturesqueness in the costumes, and a gayness about the tinsel ornaments, and a feeling of romance withal attached to the whole, that withdraws the attention of the stranger from the dirt and dilapidation that seem to be universal. It gives me no little amusement now to read the

glowing descriptions of Eastern Bazârs by Western poets. I sometimes wonder too, what these enthusiastic travellers would say, if they had a peep into a Bazâr at morning prayers; or if they had lived for a couple of years in constant intercourse with "the stately Turk," and in close contact with "the graceful flowing robe."

At 6.10 we passed through Bâb Tûma (Thomas' Gate) and followed the usual road to the village of Burzeh, at the entrance of Wady Ma'raba, which we reached in one hour. Here tradition fixes the place where Abraham turned back from pursuing the kings that had plundered the cities of Sodom, and carried off Lot. The Muslims have a Wely beside the village, to which they make annual pilgrimages during the two great feasts; and where their holy Sheikhs perform miracles by riding over the prostrate bodies of the 'faithful' without inflicting any injuries upon them! Leaving the principal part of the village upon our left, we crossed the rivulet formed by the united waters of Menîn and Helbôn, and continued in the same course N. 11 E. till we reached the foot of the range of hills, which bounds the plain of Damascus on the north, at 7.20. At this place we turned a few points to the west in ascending. The road is ancient, and in some places cut deeply in the chalky rock. Having surmounted the lowest ridge, we arrived, at 7.30, at the head of a narrow valley that lies between it and the main chain. The former strikes off from the latter at this spot; and the valley is thus shut in by their junction on this side. It is, however, open on the north-east, where, at the distance of about an hour, the low ridge terminates. An ancient aqueduct is brought along the slope of the hills from the north-east into this little valley; and, as there is no outlet for it here, it must have been intended for irrigation only.

From this place the road led up a steep mountain-side of bare white limestone. There are still traces of an ancient zigzag path, about eight feet wide, with steps hewn in the rock at intervals. It resembles at a short distance a long staircase. At 7.50 we reached the summit of the hills. The view behind us was now splendid, including the richest part of the plain of Damascus, with its many streams glittering in the morning sun, and the domes and minarets of the city rising gracefully from the midst of the dense foliage. In front of us was the valley of Menîn, and the numerous little wooded vales that run into it around the village of Tell. That village itself stood forth promi-

nently, crowning a little hill, and surrounded by orchards and gardens. Below it, a little to the left, we could see the white dome of the Wely at Hurneh. A gentle slope leads into an elevated undulating plain, the eastern portion of the Sahra. We crossed it diagonally. It is not barren at this place, though somewhat stony. The inhabitants of Tell and Hurneh cultivate a considerable portion of it; and, though not watered, save by the winter rains, it yields a scanty crop of wheat. We saw here several troops of gazelles; one of which crossed our path so near us, that by spurring my horse I was enabled to ride into the midst of them.

Our course across the plain from ridge to ridge was N. 26 E.; and we had Hurneh and Tell about forty minutes on our left hand. At 9 o'clock we began the ascent of the shelving ridge on the north side of this plain, and wound our way, by a zigzag path, to the summit in twenty minutes. From this spot we had a commanding prospect of the whole plain of the Sahra, and the lines of hills on each side of it. We could also look over the Salahiyyeh range into the Ghûtah, to the Jebel Mânî'a beyond it, and to the blue mountains of the Haurân, far away on the borders of the desert. The plain of the Sahra becomes quite narrow towards the east, and is more uneven; the spurs from the converging ridges sometimes meeting each other. About a mile to the east of where I stood, this mountain-range attains its greatest altitude. It is here, as elsewhere, very remarkable in its features. On the north side there is a gentle slope from the summit to the base; but on the south there is an almost unbroken wall of naked rock, with a steep, shelving bank from its foot to the plain below. It thus resembles the rampart and scarp of a vast fortification. From this spot Saidanâya bore N. 24 E., Wely Naser, behind Salahiyyeh, S. 36 W., and Menin, N. 78 W. I took several other important bearings; but it is not necessary to insert them.

We left this position at 9.50; and, after a descent of seven minutes, reached the head of a sweet vale, completely clothed with vines. It runs into the basin of Menin; which, seen down the vista, encircled by lofty precipices, and surrounded by a belt of dense foliage, presented a fine picture. Skirting the mountain side, through the vineyards, at the head of the valley, and crossing a low broad swell, we reached the plain of Saidanâya at 10.20. We now saw the village of Ma'arra about fifty minutes

on our right, at the foot of the slope; while over it a little to the right rose the lofty summit of Tiniyeh. The plain is here perfectly level, with a deep rich soil, and well cultivated. We crossed it diagonally; and, as we approached the northern side, had the village of Telfita about twenty-five minutes on our left, on the side of the mountain. At 11.2 we had passed the plain, and began to ascend a low but rocky spur from the mountain, turning gradually eastward as we proceeded. On the top is a square solid structure, built of hewn stones, and resembling the pedestal of a monumental column. There are no ruins near it. Descending a little from this spot we reached Saidanāya at 11.12.

Saidanāya is situated on a mass of rugged rocks, in the centre of a wide ravine. The convent, or nunnery, is built on a lofty ledge, which rises high above the houses of the village. The only approach to it is by a flight of stairs hewn in the rock, which leads to a low narrow gate covered with sheet iron and thickly studded with nails. This admits to a narrow passage, that opens into a hall, from which long galleries branch off to each side. We passed through the hall into an open area in front of the church. This church is not of great antiquity. In front on the west is a portico of four short columns supporting arches, instead of an entablature and pediment. The doorway is small and quite plain. In the interior there is a nave and side aisles, separated by ranges of columns, four in each range. In the eastern end are several apartments for the officiating clergy; and immediately behind the altar is a small lady chapel, containing the wonderful and wonder-working image of the "Blessed Virgin." The whole walls are covered with paintings, most of which would about equal, in point of merit, the first attempts at art by a school-boy with a charred stick on a white wall. As I have some little taste for the fine arts, I was anxious to examine these rare specimens. I therefore employed an attendant priest as cicerone; and, with his assistance and explanations, proceeded to unravel the mystic legends detailed on canvas. I have visited most of the galleries of London, Berlin, Vienna, and Venice; and have seen some pictures in them which do not evidence a very pure taste or a very high standard of morality; but never has it been my lot to see such disgusting obscenity, as that portrayed on the walls of this sacred retreat of chaste ruins.

Saidanāya is the holiest shrine of the Virgin connected with

the Greek church in Syria. The priest assured us that it contains a portrait of "The Mother of God," painted by Luke the Evangelist, one half of which is stone and the other half flesh! He did not, of course, explain how a *painting* could be of such materials. The building resembles a fortress, and must be of considerable antiquity. About the year 1330, Sir John Mandeville appears to have visited this place. He calls it Sardenak, and says it is five miles from Damascus. His description of its position and appearance is quite correct; and, from his statement, it seems the very same miracles were then ascribed to this strange image of the Virgin, that we now hear of.¹ Maundrell, likewise, journeyed hither from Damascus. He says, the convent was first established by the Emperor Justinian. In the sides of the precipice, beneath the walls, are some excavated tombs, a few of which have short Greek inscriptions.

From the roof of the convent I had a fine view of the surrounding country. The rocky mountain-chain, on the slope of which it is built, begins at Helbôn and runs east by north toward Saida-nâya; at a point due north from which, distant about half an hour, is its loftiest peak, called Mar Shurabîn, i. e. Saint Cherubim! from a chapel on its summit. Eastward of this the ridge gradually sinks down into the plain. The elevated plain of Saida-nâya commences near Menîn, and runs parallel to the mountains. It is about half an hour wide. On the southern side of it, the hills rise with an easy slope and are cultivated to the summit. From this place I took important bearings. I only insert such as I think may tend to make more clear to the general reader, the topography of the district. Ma'arra, S. 21 E., distant half an hour. Bedda, eastward of the former and on the same side of the plain, S. 73 E. The summit of Jebel Tintyeh, S. 74 E. Hermon, appearing from this like a beautiful cone, towering high above the neighboring mountains, S. 62 W.

We started again at 1.10. As we rode down the slope, there was on our right a square building, now called the Church of St. Paul. It is evidently of Roman origin. It is about forty feet in the side, and thirty high. It has a projecting base and a plain cornice. The door, which is on the south side, is ornamented with mouldings and a pediment. It struck my companions as resembling the lower part of the pillar of Hürmûl. It is also in form and workmanship like the lower stories of some of the

¹ Travels, London, 1839, p. 124.

tombs at Palmyra; and I have since seen a building in every respect similar at the village of Hit in Haurán.

Descending the eastern slopes from the village we again entered the plain, and rode along the base of the mountains through vineyards, and orchards of fig-trees. At 1.27 we passed a road which branches off to the left over the hills to Renkús. At 1.55 we were about opposite the village of Bedda; and here the plain widens considerably by the mountain range on our left, decreasing in breadth as well as in altitude. From hence it is little more than a broad swell. The plain which was quite flat opposite Saidanāya, is now undulating, and the soil more stony and less fertile, though still cultivated. The direction of our route, which had been hitherto N. 70 E., now turned more to the north.

At 2.35 we saw on the opposite side of the plain the gardens and threshing-floors of Hafir. The village itself is situated in a little Wady, and was not visible. It is in a line with Ma'arra and Bedda. In fifteen minutes more we came to a well, and saw the village of 'Akaubar about a quarter of a hour on our right, in the plain. Crossing a swell, the termination of the Saidanāya mountains, we passed on the left of a small ruined village called Mukhba at 3.10; and twenty minutes afterwards stopped for lunch, sitting down on the parched ground at the side of the path. We had no shade, and no water; but we had delicious grapes and savory viands from the city; and we had all been too long accustomed to Syrian travel to feel much the want of chairs and tables. There was little of interest in the landscape to call the attention; a bleak plain and barren hills filled up the view. Before us, about forty minutes distant, rose up two isolated Tells, one of which is crowned with a tomb called Wely Hābes. The summit of Jebel Tintyeh bore S. 5 E. and that of Shurabín S. 70 W. The small village of Tawāny lay about twenty minutes on our left, bearing nearly east. Behind us was a lofty wall of rock extending, unbroken, eastward and westward as far as we could see.

We were again in the saddle at 4.10; and, leaving Tawāny on our right, we gradually approached the gigantic barrier on our left. In passing over a rising ground, we found the whole plain covered with flocks of sheep and goats. Herdsmen from the mountains of Kurdistān were driving them to the market at Damascus. The dress of these men is strange, and far from pictu-

resque. They wear high conical caps, and square-shaped stiff felt coats, which stand out on each side at the shoulders as if supported on the extended arms. These coats are just sufficiently open in front to display the butts of a pair of formidable pistols and the hilt of a heavy scimeter, with a profusion of knives and dirks. When seen at a little distance, they might be easily mistaken for fragments of gray rock, so strange and rigid are their forms, and so uniform their color. The goats, too, are not less curious than their masters; large and shaggy, with spiral horns out of all proportion. These, if straight, would in some cases measure four feet in length; and, twisted as they are, many of them from tip to tip cannot be less than five feet.

At 5.7 we approached the cliffs, and entered a narrow and wild gorge, through which a small stream of water forces its way. A road was once hewn in the rock through the pass, and many of the steps can yet be seen; but during the lapse of ages immense masses of rock have fallen down from the lofty overhanging cliffs, and now almost completely block up the way. It is in some places so narrow that loaded animals cannot pass between the precipices. When riding along I could nearly put a hand on each gigantic wall. No description could convey a true impression of the rugged grandeur of that ravine. After eight minutes winding through it, we suddenly found ourselves in the midst of a little village, whose houses were perched on the sides of the rocks and cliffs around. The dark openings to vast numbers of sepulchral tombs were seen below, above, and among the houses; and gave to the whole a strange, unique appearance. My companions thought we had reached Ma'lûla, and inquired for the convent; but, to their surprise, they were informed it was still a good hour off, and that this was Jubb 'Adin. We would fondly have lingered for a time to examine this romantic spot, whose antiquity is evidenced by its sepulchres hewn out on high (Isa. 22: 16); but night was approaching, and our path not very well known; so we were forced reluctantly to take a hasty glance around the cliffs and ride off.

Jubb 'Adin is situated in a little basin, just behind the rocky crest of the mountain range. The cavity seems as if it had been hollowed out by the action of the water which breaks through the fissure; and which in a long course of ages has gradually worn away the soil and carried it into the plain below.

We struck up the eastern side of this basin in a direction

parallel to the line of the hills, and then descended into another in every way resembling the former, but considerably larger. This also communicates by means of a narrow pass with the plain. Through it runs the principal road to Yabrûd. We crossed the road in the bottom of the glen at 5.35. A similar ascent and descent brought us to the convent of Ma'lûla, which we reached at 6.15. We were received with every demonstration of respect by the worthy old superior, with whom we were well acquainted. Coffee was soon served, and some Damascus friends were introduced; in conversation with whom time passed pleasantly and profitably. An excellent dinner was spread for us in a private apartment, set apart exclusively for our own use; and we all did ample justice to the viands. The night was cold, and a strong wind whistled through the corridors and terraces of the old building. When our beds were spread, the moaning of the breeze acted as a lullaby; it was like the wildly plaintive music of my native land; and it brought sleep in the midst of a crowd of pleasing associations and tender reminiscences.

October 20th. As soon as there was sufficient light to reveal the features of glen, and crag, and peak, we set forth to examine and explore. Both my companions had been here before; and I thus reaped the benefit of their previous visits. The position of this village and its convent is so striking and peculiar, that I will attempt to describe it. Behind the mountain-ridge is a semi-circular cavity, with furrowed, cup-like sides. The diameter at the top is about two miles. The rocky crest of the mountain rises up in front, a sheer precipice; and, the whole soil having been swept away from it behind to the bottom of the cavity, it rises from thence to the summit at an angle of about fifty degrees. In this gigantic barrier there is a break, with perpendicular sides, wide in front and narrowing backward to about three hundred yards. Toward the back of this opening is a ledge of rock, with a precipice in front more than a hundred feet high, which almost completely blocks it up; leaving only a ravine on each side, in some places not more than three or four feet wide. On the summit of this ledge stands the convent; and in front of it along the foot of the cliff are the straggling houses of the little village of Ma'lûla. The whole rock around the convent, and the precipices around the village, are completely filled with artificial caves. These were, no doubt, at first intended for tombs, but at a later period they were evidently inhabited; and, from their extent and

proximity, suites of comparatively spacious rooms were formed, by opening doors of communication. I had heard much of these sepulchral caves, but without personal inspection I could have formed no adequate idea of their number and character. The whole cliffs and slopes around are like honey-combs. In one of these caves we found a wine-press in full operation. The wine made here under the superintendence of the monks is deemed the best in Antilebanon.

The convent belongs to the Greek Catholic church, and formerly contained some very ancient and curious Syriac manuscripts, now in Damascus. At the foot of the rock, on the east side of the ravine below, is another convent dedicated to Saint Thakla. The village is inhabited by Mohammedans and Christians, all of whom use the Syriac language among themselves; they also understand Arabic.

As I was anxious to obtain a wider view than that commanded from the roof of the convent, I proposed a walk to the summit of the mountain on the east of the village. My companions readily agreed, and off we went. Passing round the narrow ravine, and crossing the little stream that runs down through it, we commenced the ascent. Never was I so much deceived in any calculation of distance. The crest did not seem more than seven or eight minutes off; and yet it was not till after half an hour's hard climbing, up the naked smooth rock, that we reached it. Our toil was well repaid by the magnificent view we now obtained of the whole country. We could from this point distinctly trace the great features of this part of the Antilebanon range. We had reached the loftiest of those gigantic terraces, which form the eastern slopes of these mountains. This upper terrace is the broadest of them all. From the spot where we stood on its southern or south-eastern brow to the foot of the mountains behind it, we estimated at two hours. This latter range, which bounds it on the north-west, is the main chain of Antilebanon. It runs along on the eastern side of the plain of Zebedány, past Blúdán and Ma'rabún, and finally sinks down between Hasya and Shemstn. This ridge is of great breadth, and has an average height of about 6000 feet. The great plateau, that stretches along at its base, is comparatively level, though here and there intersected by deep valleys and water-courses. The soil, so far as I saw it, is stony, but not barren. There are few springs of water, and it is consequently parched

and burned up by the summer sun. Many parts of it are cultivated, and particularly a lower portion, like a vast basin, behind Yabrûd.

The ridge on which we now stood forms the supporting wall of this upper terrace. The summit of the ridge is but little elevated above the level of the plain itself. This correspondence in altitude, however, does not appear at first sight; as immediately behind the crest, the action of the water forcing its way through the openings into the plain below, has in the course of ages worn out a series of basins; and in traversing these the traveller seems to be now passing through defiles, and now clambering over intervening hills. It is only when a commanding position is gained, and the eye takes in the whole panorama, that the general features are perceived, and the peculiarity of their construction strikes the beholder. The several ridges, which constitute the eastern slopes of these mountains, then appear as the crests of so many broad waves driven before a storm, graceful in form and gentle in curve, as seen to the leeward, but bold, frowning and broken as we meet them.

This second great chain begins at the valley of Helbôn, just above the fountain. Its course is nearly north-east by east, with a slight curve to the north. It passes to the west of the village of Renkûs; and is intersected, as we have seen, by the wild pass at Jubb 'Adin, by the two others referred to above, and by a fourth at Yabrûd. At this last place it sweeps round to the northward, and joins the central chain. A low branch shoots out from it at Yabrûd, and sinks down between that village and Nebk.

Another ridge takes its rise at the fountain of Helbôn, runs along nearly parallel to the former to Saidanâya, and terminates as above described.

A third *general* ridge begins at Menîn. South-west of this village it may be traced in a broken line towards 'Ain es-Sâheb, at the lower part of Wady Helbôn. It runs north-east, parallel to the others, dividing the plain of Saidanâya from the eastern part of the Sahra, and decreases gradually in altitude till it terminates suddenly about an hour S. W. by W. of the village Kutaifeh in the plain of Jerûd. To the north-west of this point is an open space more than half an hour in breadth; and here the plain of Saidanâya meets that of Jerûd. The former, however, is much higher than the latter, and there is undulating,

broken ground between them. This opening extends to the end of another range of hills, which rises at a point one hour from Kutaifeh N. 75 W. and runs N. E. by E. curving to the north. It forms the boundary between the plains of Yabrûd (a continuation of that of Saidanâya) and Jerûd. This chain is different in appearance from the former; it is loftier, with sloping sides and without the crest-like summit.

The fourth general ridge is the range of the Salahtyeh hills. It runs north-east in a curved line to Jebel Tintyeh. It is much lower than any of the others, but has two lofty peaks. One is behind Salahtyeh and overlooking Damascus, which has an elevation of 1389 feet above the city, or about 3489 feet above the sea. The other, Jebel Tintyeh, is still higher. At the latter peak this range divides into two distinct chains enclosing between them a small plain, which will be referred to hereafter. One of these branches forms the south-eastern boundary of the plain of Jerûd, and the other turning nearly due east bounds the plain of Damascus on the north, and then stretches along the border of the desert to Palmyra.

From this commanding spot I roughly sketched, as is my custom, the leading features of the country, the lines of mountain ranges, and the relative positions of villages. I also took bearings of all the villages in sight, and such other places as I wished to lay down with accuracy on the map. I fear these minute details of mountains, vales and villages will not be easily comprehended without the aid of a map. To the general reader I cannot recommend one. I know of none; and I believe there is none, in which there is any true delineation of this section of country.

The view we now enjoyed was one of great interest, and in some places of grandeur; but as a whole it was desolate and barren. The only green spots that met our view were, a small section of the plain of Damascus, which could be seen over the white intervening hills; and a narrow strip at our feet along the banks of the stream, that forces its way through the chasm at Ma'lûla. We stood on the edge of a fearful precipice; the naked rock in front sinking down perpendicularly many hundred feet.

Having finished our observations, we descended as we came up. We bade farewell to our hospitable host, and rode off at ten o'clock. We followed a road up the side of the basin in a direction nearly due north, and in half an hour reached the plain

above. We spent a few minutes in looking over it, and endeavoring to ascertain the position of two villages; but in this last were unsuccessful. We now turned N. E. and travelling over undulating ground reached, at 10.56, a shallow Wady, in which we saw, a few minutes on our right, the village of Bukha'. This village, with Ma'lûla and 'Ain et-Tneh near it, are remarkable as being the only places where the ancient Syriac language is still spoken. It is used by all sects, Muslims as well as Christians; but all the people likewise know Arabic.

At eleven o'clock, having surmounted a rising ground beyond the little Wady, we had below us, and stretching away far before us, a plain almost perfectly level; not of great breadth near the spot where we stood, but widening as it advanced. This plain is depressed below the surface of the plateau about 200 feet. Along the south-east side runs the bare ridge of naked rock sloping upward to the crest, as described above. From this spot, too, we could see through the gorge the fine village of Yabrâd, surrounded by its gardens and orchards. It bore N. 50 E.

Our road ran over the plain, near the foot of the hills. There was nothing here to interest, or please the eye. The soil is better than in the plateau above, and large tracts are cultivated. We could see here and there in the distance the husbandman with his yoke of oxen, turning up the soil, and preparing it for the seed. A smart ride of an hour and a half, brought us to the small village of Râs el-'Ain, at the entrance of the Yabrâd pass. In the village we saw a few hewn stones and some fragments of large columns; but no other remains of antiquity. Beside it is a fine fountain, shaded by a beautiful weeping willow. The waters are led over the neighboring gardens and vineyards, which they cover with verdure. Turning from this village, we passed on toward the ravine. It is not so narrow or so grand as that of Ma'lûla, but it is more picturesque. The dense foliage of the trees relieves the stern grandeur of the white cliffs, while the luxuriant vineyards, intersected by little canals and rivulets, give a softness to the scene.

We observed as we rode along a few caves in the face of the precipices above us. In one of these, high up, I saw a basket suspended to the roof; and was still more surprised when a female form appeared at the entrance. This was the house of the "Nâtâr," or keeper of the vineyards. Five minutes below Râs el-'Ain we came to another fountain called Neba' Yabrâd. The

water springs up and forms a miniature lake, clear as crystal, at the foot of the northern cliff. A lovely plat of green turf stretches along its bank. This was too sweet a spot to be passed by weary, hungry and thirsty travellers. Our morning's walk and midday's ride had whetted our appetites. So picketing our horses, lunch was spread, and water served from the fountain, cool and refreshing. The friendly *Natūr* brought some bunches of fine looking grapes; but we found them still sour and unpalatable. The ground and air are cold here, he said, and the grapes are long in ripening.

We left this lovely spot at 1.25, and rode through the glen to Yabrūd. As we advanced, my attention was arrested by a lofty conical hill, white as snow from base to summit. Rising up regular as a pyramid over the foliage of the intervening gardens, it had a most singular appearance. It is, perhaps, nearly five hundred feet high; and its sides are smooth as if dressed by human hands. It is of chalky rock, and resembles some of those along the Barada, near Damascus, but is much whiter. It is completely isolated, and is more than a quarter of a mile from the main chain.

As we approached the village we saw a number of men engaged in digging the madder roots; an operation of much labor, as they have to excavate to the depth of some five feet. They first saturate the soil with water, and then while it is moist they dig. At 1.48 we entered the village. As we rode through the streets our attention was first attracted by a square building in every respect resembling that at Saidanāya. Being guided to the church, I was astonished to see the beauty and solidity of its walls. They must be ascribed to the age of Roman rule in Syria. The stones, too, were still more ancient; for in many of them is seen the Phenician bevel. In the walls of private houses, in the mosk, and about the streets and lanes, are also broken columns, and large hewn stones in profusion; bearing testimony to the pristine importance of the place. The situation is such as would in any age naturally draw toward it a considerable population. It is built in a level plain on the eastern side of the Ma'lūla range of mountains, at the place where it turns northward. The water which supplies it, and spreads luxuriant vegetation over the gardens and fields around, flows from two sublime glens in the neighboring hills. One of these is that we came through; the other is further to the north-east. The peo-

ple are robust and healthy in appearance. They have a freshness in their countenance, and an elasticity in their bodies, that are the sure indications of pure air. It would seem, indeed, as if the only disease known were ophthalmia, which is occasioned no doubt by the dazzling whiteness of the surrounding country. There is here a large number of Christians belonging to the Syrian Catholic church. The church is a large building, and the residence of the bishop beside it is extensive and handsome.

Yabrûd is a place of considerable antiquity. It was the seat of a bishop in the early ages of the Christian church. The name *Jabruda* is found in the Acts of the Councils of both Nice and Chalcedon. It is mentioned also by Ptolemy. It sometimes was ranked under Damascus; and at other times under the metropolitan city Edessa.¹

We left Yabrûd at 2.10, and took the road along the base of the white hill in a direction about S. 19 E. In half an hour we reached the top of a broad swell that here crossed the plain diagonally, striking out eastward from the Ma'lûla range. We descended from this into a fertile vale, and on the rising ground, on the opposite side of it, saw the village of Küstûl. At 3.8 we reached this place. Küstûl is on the great Aleppo road, which runs from this in nearly a straight line to Nebk. It is situated towards the south-eastern side of the plain of Yabrûd, which, as above stated, is a continuation of that of Saidanâya; and is near the foot of the range of mountains that separates this plain from the plain of Jerûd. The country between this and Nebk is perfectly flat; and the latter place is seen in the distance bearing N. 32½ E. Küstûl is mentioned by Abulfeda as a district "which borders on Lebanon and lies between Hums and Damascus." The name suggests the Latin *Castellum*. An ancient castle may have once stood here to protect the caravan road. There are still some remains of antiquity in the large old Khân. The village consists of about thirty houses built round the caravansary, a large structure resembling those found along the leading roads in every part of Syria. There is a "Kastel" put down on the map of Berghaus; but it is there N. by E. of Yabrûd, instead of S. by E. In fact this whole region in Berghaus's map is a mere fancy sketch. A range of mountains is made to run between Yabrûd and the Aleppo road, whereas the whole is a perfect plain.

¹ Relandi Palestina, p. 217.

We were on horseback again at 3.15, and pursued our journey at a quick pace toward the south-west along the caravan road. The ground is undulating; and the road follows a serpentine course between little swelling hills and by the sides of water-courses, now dry. It is only occasionally the traveller can get a peep at the plain around. This is not a great loss, however, for a more dreary and barren tract could scarce be imagined. There are no trees; there is no verdure; there is nothing to attract the eye but the blasted gravelly soil, and the white mountain-sides beyond, and the unvarying blue sky above. The bold cliffs that crown the ridges westward, form the only features of the landscape; all the rest is bare and monotonous. Nor is there anything to mark your progress as you urge your steed onward, save the half-ruined wells, excavated by a more provident generation, to collect a little water during the winter rains, that the weary traveller might have wherewith to refresh his parched lips during the long summer drought.

Having turned to the left a little, and entered a narrow defile, running nearly parallel to the mountain-range, we reached at six o'clock a ruined Khân. Five minutes before reaching it, we observed on our right the road that comes from Ma'lûla, through 'Ain et-Tineh. We were now at the western end of the fine pass that completely intersects these mountains, and through which the stream from Ma'lûla, in winter, forces its way to the plain of Jerûd. We continued our journey by the dim light of the moon. The rocks and precipices above and around assumed a thousand fantastic shapes as the silvery moonlight fell upon them. I observed that, soon after entering the ravine, the road is hewn out in the rock along the mountain-side on the right, to avoid the bed of a stream which, though now quite dry, must in winter be an angry torrent; as it is the only outlet for the surplus waters of the basin at Ma'lûla, and of the intervening plain. From this it descends into a wider valley, with steep, wooded sides. In forty minutes from the Khân we emerged from the pass into the fine plain of Jerûd. A deserted Khân stands near the foot of the mountain on this side. In thirty-five minutes more we reached Kutaifeh.

It was now late, and we had some difficulty in finding a place for ourselves and horses. We at last succeeded in rousing a family; and having secured, in separate stables, our unruly animals, whose fierce spirits a few hours ride had not tamed, we

spread our beds on the floor of a clean apartment. Dinner soon appeared, and with it our venerable host, who had no doubt scented the good things. Sugar, he said, was good for the colic, with which he had been sadly troubled for some time past. This was quite a new remedy to us; but, as our servant had just opened a little case of the coveted article, we indulged the old man's longings.

October 21st. Before the first streak of light had appeared on the eastern horizon, we were up and had commenced our frugal morning meal. As we had expressed our intention of going to Maksûra, we were now endeavoring to bargain for a guide. Many a fear was expressed as to our safety; and many a doubt as to whether the Arabs would allow us to pass, at least with such comfortable clothing. We were assured a strong guard of villagers would be absolutely necessary. After much talk and no little noise, we succeeded in persuading the son of our host to accompany us. Before starting, however, I wished to take some bearings, and went up to the top of the house; but my object being known I was invited by our new guide to ascend the minaret connected with the mosk. Considerably surprised at such an invitation from a Muslim, I readily and gladly followed him. On our way up, we met the Mu'ezzin; he had just been summoning the faithful to morning prayer. I had to wait some time ere the sun's rays revealed the objects I wished to see. I then sketched the features of the great plain, and the mountain ranges in sight; and took several important bearings.

About two hours distant, S. 56 W., rose the lofty summit of Jebel Tintyeh. A little to the right of it was the termination of the Menîn range, which we had crossed in going to Saidanâya. To the right of this again I could look over the plain of Saidanâya to the lofty summit of Shurabîn. There commences the ridge of lofty hills that separates the plain of Jerûd from that of Yabrûd. These hills attain their greatest altitude about an hour and a half from their commencement, and then gradually decrease as they advance. The line of the Aleppo road, and entrance of the pass, through which we came last night, bears due north. Away eastward runs the broad plain of Jerûd. It is about an hour and a quarter wide at this place, but increases as it advances. It has a level surface, and a fertile soil as far as 'Atny; but beyond that it is barren and stony. Two long subterranean aqueducts, one near the base of the north-eastern hills, and the other

between Mu'addamiyeh and Jerūd, collect water for irrigation. Nearly five hours distant, N. 60 E., I could distinctly see the beginning of the mountain-chain that there divides the plain, and runs unbroken to the south of Kuryetein, and from thence to Palmyra. In my journey to the latter city, about a year and a half before, I went on the south side of this range to near its termination, and then crossed over to the northern side, about four hours from Palmyra. On my return, I kept on the northern side the whole way, along the vast and dreary plain to Kuryetein, and thence to 'Atny and Jerūd. Jerūd bears from Kutaifeh N. 64 E., distant two and a half hours with camels. Beyond it is an extensive salt marsh, like a little lake. Mu'addamiyeh bears N. 82 E., distant forty minutes with camels. Ruhaibeh is at the foot of the hills, N. 89 E., distant about an hour and a quarter.

The Palmyra road leaves that to Aleppo, at Kutaifeh; from this village to Damascus they are united, and cross the Salahiyeh range of hills near the eastern side of Jebel Tiniyeh. The distance is $5\frac{1}{2}$ hours. The country we had passed through so far, has been visited, though never, so far as I know, accurately or fully described. Dr. Eli Smith appears to have followed nearly the same route pursued by us from Damascus to Yabrūd.¹ The note by Tannūs there given, to the effect that, "The country from Tell and Menin to the environs of Hums, is not susceptible of cultivation," is not altogether accurate. There is no question that a great part of it is now barren; but still, as I have stated above, large tracts of the plains between Tell and Yabrūd might be cultivated with profit; and in many places the soil is good and fertile. At a little distance, the whole region looks like a parched desert, especially when seen toward the close of summer; but when more closely examined, we perceive a light though stony soil, sufficient, when watered by the rains of winter, to yield a crop of wheat. The country is in most places well adapted for the cultivation of the vine and the fig. Here, as at Helbôn, I observed a small white grape, greatly resembling some of those grown on the banks of the Rhine. The wines made in the district are esteemed among the best in Syria.

We left Kutaifeh at 7.20, and crossed the plain in a direction due south. We were here entering on new ground. No traveler had ever traversed the mountains now before us, or visited the

¹ Biblical Researches, Vol. III. Appendix, p. 171.

village beyond. In twenty-five minutes we reached the foot of the hills, and entered a little Wady up which we wound our way to the summit, turning a little to the right. At 8.3 we were on the top of the ridge. We now observed how this chain divides; one branch turning eastward, and the other, on which we stood, north-east by east. Descending five minutes to a shallow Wady between the ridges, we turned down it N. 62 E., and then gradually swept round the base of a hill toward the east. At 8.30 we had passed this hill and entered another Wady, running nearly parallel to the former. Down this we rode, in the bed of a winter torrent, to the side of a little undulating plain, which seems completely encompassed with mountains. It is almost wholly barren, like the hillsides around. It has no fountains, and affords but scanty fare to the flocks of goats we saw scattered over it. On a rock beside our path I observed a bush of the Caper tree. It has long shoots something similar to the vine, but covered with thorns. This is the only one I saw in Antilebanon. They are, however, common in Lebanon.

At nine o'clock, we reached the foot of a range of lofty hills, running here at nearly right angles to our course. Our road now turned along its base nearly due south, and ran along in the bottom of a valley. Here we struck the direct road from Damascus to Ruhaibeh. At 9.8 we reached a small fountain of brackish water. The valley now becomes wilder and if possible more desolate, having steep and rocky banks of white limestone. We followed it in its winding course till we entered the plain of Damâscus at 9.45. From this point the plain seems of vast extent; extending westward to the base of Hermon, south-west to Mâni'a, and southward to Jebel Haurân; while on the east it is shut in by the graceful group of the *Tellûl* or Jebel Aghâr. It appears from this place to be completely encircled by mountains.

Our guide manifested considerable anxiety as we approached the plain. He seized his musket with a firmer grasp, drew his girdle tighter, and otherwise arranged his dress, "girding up his raiment," as if preparing for action. Many a strange and exciting tale did he relate, too, of the encounters of his people with the Arabs, of his own hairbreadth escapes, and of the danger he now ran on this account, should the enemies of his people meet him. As we rode along, therefore, we kept a sharp lookout. We knew ourselves that we were on the borders of civilization,

if not beyond them; and that if we encountered the Bedawins we had a fair chance to be plundered. As we surmounted the last spur of the mountain we looked anxiously over the broad level expanse lying before us; but we sought in vain for the black tent, or the wide-spreading flock, or the roving cavaliers. There was the ploughman with his oxen, and the village shepherd with his few goats, and the peasant with his hoe, all peacefully following their several avocations. Our guide was pleased, and we were disappointed, perhaps agreeably. No matter. Maksúra was now before us, the road straight, and the way clear. We paid off our guide, and he returned in peace; while we set forward at a brisk pace to the village.

Our road was now south-east, over a flat and fertile plain. On our left, as we advanced, the mountains receded, and decreased in altitude. A Wady of some breadth completely intersects the whole range; and on each side of it the mountains rise up again with a gradual slope. At 10.20 we reached Maksúra.

Our attention, as we approached this place, had been for some time drawn to a large and heavy building, rising high above the flat roofs of the village houses; and which, from its position on the summit of a gentle eminence, is a conspicuous object for many miles around. To this we at once directed our horses; and on reaching it were no little astonished at the size, beauty and completeness of the structure. It is a temple of Corinthian architecture, oblong in form, and having a large door at both east and west end. At each end are pilasters supporting a rich entablature and pediment. A deep cornice was carried round the whole exterior of the building, supported by pilasters at the angles and along the sides. The lofty arched doorways admit to small vestibules; and from these doors open to the body of the building. These doorways being all in a line, there was thus a clear passage through the temple from east to west. The interior is nearly square; on each side are three pilasters, and a very rich cornice runs round the whole. The walls are almost perfect, though they have been disfigured by an attempt to convert it into a fortification. With the exception of the temples at Ba'albek and Palmyra, I have seen none in this country in such good preservation; and there are few that could be compared with it for beauty of design, though the architecture is not in the best style.

On the west end, near the north-east corner, about ten feet

from the ground, we found the following inscription; the first part in very large characters, but the remainder much smaller.

ΥΠΕΡCωTHPIAC TωNKYPIωN
 HMωNAYTOKPATOPωNKAI C
 APωNMAPKωNIOYAIωN
 ::::::::::CTω:::::AΦIEPω
 ΘHKAI CYNETEAE CΘHN AOC AEIXA
 AACEΠITωNΠEPIN|||APKONAYPHAI
 ONANEONΓAωPOYKAIΓA|||PONOA(?)CIM(?)
 ΘOYBOY|||AEYTOYEIPOTAMIωN

EKTωNTOY
 ΘEOYETOY C
 ZNΦYΠEPBEPB
 TAI OY·IE

From the top of the temple, to which I ascended by a staircase at the south-east angle, I had a commanding view of the vast plain. In the distance, south by east, I saw three large-looking buildings, called the *Diûru*, the "convents." I was informed they were large castles, but could not get any minute description of them. The people informed me that they lie between the lakes and the group of hills to the east, called the Tellûl. This, from their position, I deemed correct; and it afterwards proved to be so. At the distance of about an hour south-east I saw a small ruined building, apparently a tower; and perhaps intended as a watch tower, as well as to guard a stream of water that flows past it. A broad Wady divides the mountain ridges opposite to Maksûra, running up due north into the plain of Jerûd at Ruhaibeh; and down this, from a fountain at the latter village, flows a fine stream, which passes through Maksûra and waters the plain beyond. It is called Nahr el-Mukubrit, the Sulphurous River. The water, however, is sweet and good. This is an important stream; and, if the water were properly managed, would irrigate a large extent of the plain. During winter it falls into the Bahret esh-Shurkiyeh.

We were informed, just as we were about to mount our horses, that ruins of an extensive city lay about half an hour eastward on the borders of the desert. It was now past noon, and we had a long journey before us; but still we did not wish to leave such a place unexplored. So, accompanied by the Sheikh and a

number of the villagers, we set off. As we left the gardens, in which are good vineyards, we observed a number of large sarcophagi of white limestone, and likewise many sepulchral caves, hewn out in the conglomerate rock of the plain. In twenty-two minutes we came to a subterranean canal, which brings a fine stream from the base of the lofty mountains on the left, called Jebel el-Kaus, or Jebel Abn el-Kaus. A few hundred yards on our right, the water flows out over the surface, and part of it runs past the tower above mentioned.

Eight minutes afterward we reached a large reservoir filled with pure delicious water, supplied by a canal similar to the former. A large stream flows from it and is carried in little channels over the fields. Beside this reservoir are many hewn stones. Five minutes beyond this we reached the commencement of extensive ruins extending away to the right. Riding through these we reached in ten minutes further the foundations of a large and strong fortress, or citadel, of a rectangular form, about three hundred yards long by some two hundred and fifty broad. In the centre of each side is a gate with flanking towers; and there were heavy towers at the angles. The whole is now almost completely prostrate; but the immense heaps of hewn stones and fragments of columns, both along the walls and within the inclosure, bear ample testimony to its former importance. On the western side of it are the ruins of the city, covering a space more than a mile and a half in circumference. We were told that another stream descends from the mountains a little further east, and that there is a *Diwân*, or theatre, near it. We had no time to visit them.

For these ruins we could get no other name than *Khureibeh*. The reservoir and water the Sheikh called *Durattyeh*. We could see no inscriptions; but our search was not at all minute, and I doubt not inscriptions exist.

We galloped back to Maksûra, feeling sorry we had no time to spend among the ruins. On our way we saw on our left a large and deep canal, now dry. This, we were informed, is the continuation of the canal called *Yezid*, which is taken from the Barada near Hâmy, and runs through *Salahiyeh*. This, however, is not correct. This canal is the continuation of a great subterranean aqueduct, which commences near the village of *Kossair*, about three hours north-east of Damascus. That great work was no doubt intended to supply this city with water.

We left Maksūra at 3.10. As we emerged from the village, we met a small party of Arabs, splendidly mounted. They were the chiefs of a neighboring tribe who had come to trade. In the gardens around the village we saw large quantities of hewn stones strewn over the ground. Our road was now like an avenue; and led across a plain with a good soil, perfectly flat, but uncultivated. Our direction was a few points south of west. On our right, at the distance of less than an hour, was the range of naked hills that here bound the plain. At 4.25 we saw an old Khân at the foot of the hills; and below it the last of the little mounds that mark the openings of the subterranean aqueduct. From hence eastward it flows in an open channel. At 5.40 we reached the village of 'Adrah, and forty minutes after, struck the Aleppo road. The daylight was now gone, but the road was good, the moon bright, and nothing to fear. So we spurred our horses toward the city. At 6.48 we passed Khân Kossair; at 7.30 we had Dûma on our right; and at 9.15 we entered Bâb Tûma.

We were thus six hours and five minutes from Maksūra to Damascus; and, considering the pace at which we rode, I would estimate the distance at not less than twenty-six miles. The Bahret esh-Shurkiyeh was some distance on our left as we rode from Maksūra to 'Adrah. At the latter village, the Nahr Taura, a branch of the Barada, turns south-east and flows into that lake.

SUMMARY OF ITINERARY.

	h. m.		
Oct. 19th. Damascus			<i>Return.</i>
Burzeh	1.0	19th. Yabrūd	
Saidanāya	3.32	Kūstāl	.58
'Akauber	1.40	Kutaifeh	4.0 — 4.58
Tawāny	.58	21st. Maksūra	3.0
Jubb 'Adin	.50	'Adra	2.30
Ma'lûla	.53 — 8.53	Damascus	3.35 — 9.08
20th. Bukha'	.50		
Râs el-'Ain	1.30		
Yabrūd	.30 — 2.50		

ARTICLE II.

DRUIDISM.

By Rev. Edward D. Morris, Auburn, N. Y.

MOST of those errant tribes who at the beginning of the Christian era inhabited the northern and north-western portions of the continent of Europe, were distinguished by striking similarities of language, of institutions, and of character. Such resemblances plainly lead to the conclusion, that these numerous tribes, scattered over the wide regions from the shores of the Atlantic to the Baltic Sea, were the disparted offshoots of some common oriental stock. During those long periods which lie beyond the limits of authentic history, they probably migrated at intervals from the sunny lands of Central Asia to the plains of Germany and Gaul; constantly pressed onward, partly by necessity, and partly by the larger hordes which followed them, till at last, they found their devious course obstructed by the waters of the western ocean. But, through all their long and frequent wanderings, and in spite of mutual diversities and conflicts, they carefully preserved the prominent peculiarities of that common stock from which they sprang. Their numerous dialects are manifestly the kindred scions of some generic root. Their social and civil institutions have many curious and striking points of similarity. Their religious sentiments, and their varied modes of worship, appear like fragments of some ancestral system, such as may in some past age have flourished along the banks of the Euphrates and the Indus.

None of these points of resemblance is more obvious or more remarkable than DRUIDISM. From that period in which the regions of Northern Europe were first subdued by Roman power, to that in which the advancing influences of Christianity had rooted out most of the prominent characteristics of Celtic barbarism, this peculiar institution is known to have held an important position, and wielded a commanding influence, among nearly all the Indo-Germanic tribes. As a social system, at once civil and religious, it entered into all departments of society; and left its distinct impression on all the prominent features of individual

and national life. Druidism, therefore, becomes an interesting theme of research and of contemplation, in reference both to its distinctive elements, and to its position as one of those primary forces whose influences sometimes combined and sometimes antagonistic, have evolved as a resulting product the complex society of modern Europe. It will be the main design of this Article, to bring into view the more prominent features and elements of this peculiar system; and to define the nature and extent of its influence over those unlettered tribes among whom it flourished.

It is a striking fact, that almost every nation, at some early period in its organic growth, has had within itself a distinctive body of men, who, by superior wisdom and greater sagacity, have attained a commanding position and wielded a controlling influence in the various departments of the national life. The potent agency of the several schools of Grecian philosophy, in moulding the character and shaping the destinies of the Hellenic tribes, has been the subject of frequent remark. An equally potent influence was exercised at an earlier period by that powerful priesthood, who, in the brighter days of ancient Egypt, dwelt at Thebes and Memphis. Nor are such phenomena peculiar to ancient times. The priests of modern Judea, and the philosophers of modern China, still retain a similar position. Holding in their hands the keys of both knowledge and religion, and standing at the sources of the national character, they are fashioning the ideas and coloring the destiny of the uncounted millions who swarm that eastern world. The influence of such classes as these, varies in proportion to the stage of progress at which the nation has arrived, and to the unfolding of individual sagacity and enterprise. In the earlier periods of national development, when knowledge is possessed by few, and physical is regarded as superior to mental power, that influence is extensive and controlling. But, as knowledge increases and is more generally diffused, and men begin to realize the superiority of intellectual over bodily force, it rapidly declines in both extent and potency, and is speedily lost in the general enlightenment and growth.

Precisely such a body of men were the ancient *Druids*. They were the sole possessors of whatever learning and science had found their way into those northern wilds. They were the sole makers and administrators of law, subordinate to the royal authorities. They were the only teachers of both wisdom and

religion. They, therefore, necessarily occupied a commanding position in the rude tribes among whom they dwelt. No body of men, ancient or modern, ever wielded a more absolute sway. They controlled the movements of both princes and people. They incited to war, or persuaded to peace. They scattered or withheld instruction at pleasure. They were the only guides, that sought to conduct the faltering traveller through the vale of life to a distant eternity.

Before proceeding to speak more minutely of the Druidic order, it is desirable to define more exactly the precise limits within which their influence was exercised. Although they were scattered throughout the whole of Northern Europe, they, nevertheless, appear to have flourished mostly in certain special districts. The region of Bretagne and the northern part of Wales, including the modern isle of Anglesey, seem to have been the grand centres of their power. Here were the residences of the chief men of the order. Here were established their largest schools, and their most spacious temples. Here were gathered together the most learned and discreet of their number, whose decrees, prepared in council, the inferior members of the order were bound to carry into execution. Here was found all the learning, that could be obtained from internal or from foreign sources. In these strongholds, the order were able for many centuries to maintain their position against every opposing power. Nor was it till these seats of Druidic empire had been overthrown and destroyed by the Roman axe and fire, that the influence of the order began to waver and decline.

Bearing this fact in mind, let us now proceed to the proposed investigation. There are three directions in which this singular body of men should be considered: as *men of learning*, on whom devolved the entire business of public and private instruction; as a *political organization*, to whom was committed the administration of justice, whether civil or criminal; and as *religious teachers*, whose calling it was to instruct the ignorant multitudes in those solemn relations which this life bears to another state of being. For it is an unquestionable fact, that the Druidic order sustained each and all of these relations to the tribes among whom they dwelt. Secular instruction in every department was given by them alone. The forms of public law were moulded by their hands. They constituted the only civil tribunal. They had the management of all religious ceremonies;

and from them came the only light that shone on that barbaric darkness.

As *men of learning*, the Druids appear to have been widely known and greatly revered. Like the Romish priesthood of the Middle Ages, they held within their grasp all the learning of their times; and lent their scholarly aid even to men of the most exalted position. To them came all the youth of Northern Europe for training and instruction. Even the sons of nobles and monarchs sat at their feet, in order to be initiated into their curious mysteries. These they often bore away into their retired groves, in the heart of which their schools were always located; where they trained them, sometimes for a long term of years, in natural, in political, and in religious science. The instruction in all of these departments was always oral, and generally in the form of triadic verse.¹ It is a curious fact, that, although the order were unquestionably acquainted with the art of writing, no attempt was ever made to preserve their instructions in any connected form. Every such attempt was understood among them to be a punishable crime; so anxious were they to preserve their acquirements within their own limits, and thus to continue their ascendancy over the popular mind.

It is obvious, that much uncertainty must exist in relation to the actual amount of knowledge possessed by the Druidic order. They lived among an uncultivated people. They were almost wholly cut off from contact with Grecian and Roman civilization. And yet we have clear evidence, that for the rudimental times in which they lived, their learning in some directions was eminent and extensive. That they were somewhat acquainted with astronomy, and, therefore, with all those branches of science which are subordinate to this, is evident from their ability to determine by solar and lunar motions the return of their monthly and annual religious solemnities. They also laid claim to a thorough acquaintance with botany and mineralogy, with espe-

¹ The British Triads, among the most curious phenomena to be found in literature, are based on the assumption that every substance has three, and only three, proper qualities; and that all true science consists in the correct discovery of these, and all true instruction in the accurate statement of them to others. Let the following serve as an illustration: Tri chynnonior doethineb: uvuddhad i ddeddau Duw; ymgais ab lles dyn; a dioddev yn lew pob digwydd bywyd. There are three characteristics of wisdom: obedience to the laws of God; effort for the good of men; and brave endurance of the chances and mischances of life.

cial reference to the uses of plants and minerals in the practice of medicine. Rhetoric, and, especially, the kindred art of poetry, were made by them an object of particular study and culture.¹ The political relations of the order created a necessity for the cultivation of some crude form of political science; for the enacting and administration of law cannot be carried on, even in the rudest forms of society, without the development of, at least, the rudiments of jurisprudence. But their position as teachers of religion, gave them still fairer opportunity for meditation and improvement. Their speculations in this department, so far as they have been preserved, give ample evidence of much patient and ingenious thought respecting the nature and attributes of God, the position and character of man in this life, and his existence and destiny hereafter. Taliesin, the earliest of the Welsh bards, speaks of himself as a member of the Druidic order, and acquainted with their mysteries; and frequently alludes to their views of the formation of the world, of the nature and powers of man, and of the inherent principles of things.

So much, at least, is known respecting the amount of information possessed by this peculiar order. Far more than this has sometimes been asserted; but, as there is reason to believe, on insufficient evidence. It may, however, fairly be presumed, though it be improper with our present light to assert, that their knowledge extended in other directions besides those already mentioned. For an acquaintance even with the rudiments of astronomy and medicine, legislation and theology, implies such a degree of development as renders the possessor competent to understand, and make himself master, to the same extent, of every other department of human investigation. The presumption in question is, therefore, warrantable, though the facts are not at hand to prove it true.

As a *political body*, the Druids seem to have exercised a powerful influence among all the Celtic tribes. It has already been remarked, that they were the sole enactors and administrators of law, subordinate to the royal authorities. The civil code was thus almost exclusively under their control. To every crime they attached a religious as well as civil penalty; thus making every act of transgression a moral as well as a political offence.

¹ The general subject of the Ancient Poets and Poetry of Wales, and, as included in this, the special relations of the Bardic to the Druidic order, have already been considered at sufficient length in Bib. Sac. April, 1850.

Before them as a supreme tribunal, from whose decision there was but one appeal, came every offender against the public order. In the execution of their decrees, whether relating to civil or to religious affairs, they often visited those who refused to obey them, with the most condign punishment. Resistance made the victim both an outlaw and an apostate. Civil power granted him no protection; and society no favor. Cut off, like the Hebrew leper, from all communion with his kind, he wandered away accursed and neglected into some distant mountain recess, where his life and his miseries were ended together.

This intimate connection between the civil institutions and the religious system of the Celtic tribes, is a striking feature in their history. It suggests, at once, the blended civil and religious elements in the Mosaic code. It has even been urged with great earnestness as a convincing argument to prove the oriental origin of the Druidic order. Like that of the early Hebrews, the Celtic law was rendered doubly effective by thus superadding to civil punishment a fearful priestly condemnation. Over the one race as over the other, the mandate of recognized authority must have wielded an undisputed control. It is to this blending of the civil and the religious, that we are also to trace that strong sentiment of fraternity which existed so generally among these northern tribes. Though widely separated in position, and sometimes quite diverse in character, this common element of Druidism bound them all into one living and effective whole. At no period was the strength of this sentiment more manifest, than when the several tribes of Britain, incited by Druid leaders, maintained for so many years a bloody conflict with the invading legions of Rome. Nor was it, till the most vigorous efforts had succeeded in destroying the grand centre of Druidism in the ancient isle of Mona, and had thus cut this common bond of union, that victory was secured to the Roman arms.

As a *religious organization*, the Druids deserve a special consideration; for, while they acted as teachers of secular learning, and occupied so prominent a place in political affairs, they were still preëminently a religious body; their spiritual function being viewed and treated as the most important. Under this general head, we will notice successively their doctrines, their rites and ceremonies, and their temples and sacrificial altars:

Doctrines. The doctrines of the order, if we may judge from the scanty remains yet in preservation, were a somewhat curious

compound of poetic fancies and philosophical speculations. The author of the *Celtic Researches*, who was profoundly versed in the archaeology of Northern Europe, has affirmed that no body of men in heathen nations, ever preserved the early religious opinions of mankind with more simplicity or with more sincerity. At the same time, it must be admitted, that, with these truthful views of the nature of religion, there was blended much that was in a high degree fanciful and superstitious.

The Druids believed in a single supreme Deity, who created and governed all things by his own inflexible will. To this supreme being they gave the names of *Sâl*, the sun; *Faran*, the thunder; and perhaps certain others, such as *Hesus* and *Teutates*. They also affirmed the existence of many inferior divinities; some of whom were creations of the original Deity, while others were princes and heroes, who, for their bravery and virtue, had been exalted to this high station. These inferior beings were especially ordained to carry into execution the mandates of the One supreme; though they possessed an inherent power over men, which they could exercise independently of all superior control.

The Druids also held, that man is a fallen intelligence, who by his fall has lost all knowledge of former states of being; and that in order to regain his original position, he must pass through several preparatory stages of existence, of which this life is the first and introductory. They believed that man is the grand end of nature, as well as the most glorious being in it; for whom, in his fallen condition, this world and all it contains were especially created. Maintaining that man is capable of discerning good and evil, they held that, if he preferred the evil, he lapsed again into a lower and more brutish state of being; from which he might, though with less hope of success, attempt to regain his original position. But if, on the other hand, he preferred the good, he was borne at death to a higher sphere, where the memory of his first mode of being returned, and where he rapidly advanced toward the perfection which properly belongs to him. They also held that even in this life the good and the true are becoming more and more established; that, finally, the whole race would reach such a stage of perfection, that this world would be of no further service as a scene of trial and discipline; and that, when this culminating period arrived, and the race had been translated to a higher abode, the earth would be swept out of being.

To these fundamental tenets, the order added many minor speculations, which it would be impracticable here to notice in detail. These general statements, taken in connection with all that is implied in them, will furnish the reader with an accurate impression of the doctrinal element in the Druidic religion.

Rites and Ceremonies. Respecting the modes of worship observed by the Druids, little can be known with certainty. The remaining ruins of their places of congregation furnish plain evidence, that they frequently offered sacrifices; nor can it be denied, that human life was sometimes made an offering to their supreme divinity. There are, however, some of their ceremonies, such as the veneration paid by them to the oak, and their monthly gathering of the mistletoe, respecting which authentic information has come down to modern times.

The regard entertained by the ancient Britons for the oak, a regard which has been perpetuated in Wales even to the present day, is deserving of some notice.¹ The earliest Welsh poetry extant frequently speaks, in Druidic phrase, of the oak as the natural symbol of their supreme Deity. In all their religious observances, the members of the order were crowned with garlands made from the leaves of the oak. All instruction, whether secular or religious, was given in groves of oak. In these consecrated places, far removed from all disturbing scenes, the Druids held their daily and monthly worship. Frequent allusions to this fact are found in the classic authors. In no particular did the Roman armies encounter so great difficulty in their assaults upon the British tribes, as in their endeavors to enter these secret penetralia. Nor was it till they had almost wholly destroyed their opponents, that they were able to pierce those dim and imposing forests, which protected the central ones of the order, in the little isle of Anglesey.

*Perhaps the most curious among the Druidic observances was the monthly gathering of the mistletoe. When the moon had reached the sixth day of her waxing, the Druids proceeded with great pomp, and accompanied by the multitudes, to some tree on which the desired plant had been found to be growing. White bulls were led with the procession, for the purpose of sacrifice. A priest, clad in white, ascended the tree, and severed from it

¹ It is generally admitted that the term Druid is a proper derivation from the Cymric word Dryw or Derw, an oak. That the ordinary Welsh word, Dewydd, which signifies a Druid, is a derivative from this old root, is unquestionable.

the coveted prize, which was received in a white cloth below. The consecrated victims were then sacrificed; and the ceremony was concluded with feasting and general rejoicing. The plant thus obtained was supposed to be a valuable remedy for all diseases, and especially a preventive against poison. The monthly gathering of it was, therefore, an occasion of great joy among the people.

Temples and Sacrificial Altars. It is now generally conceded, that most of the ruins found in different sections of England and Wales, are of Druidic origin. The traces of the Roman invasion are so distinct from these more ancient remains, that it is impossible to confound them. We are carried back to a period anterior to the times of Caesar and Paulinus, a period when quite another race lived and flourished in the Anglian Isle. These remains are commonly divided into three classes: the Gorsedd, the Cromlech, and the Cistvaen. We will notice them in their order:

The gorsedd at Stonehenge stands on a level area, at the summit of a hill, around the base of which a circular bank and trench are still visible. In this area sixty stones, from thirteen to twenty feet in height, are arranged in a circle of an hundred feet in diameter. Within this circle is another, composed of forty stones about six feet in height, arranged in the same order as those of the outer circle. Within this inner circle is an elliptical ring, composed of stones ten in number, which increase in size as they approach one of the extremities. In one of the foci of this ellipse lies a marble slab, sixteen feet in length and four in width, which is surrounded by a number of single stones of a smaller size than any before mentioned. In each of these circles many of the stones are still upright, though some of them have been prostrated in the course of ages.

A still more wonderful ruin is found at Avebury, in Wiltshire. Within the outer circle of this gorsedd stands the present village; the area enclosed by it being more than twenty acres. The first circle of stones within this area is thirteen hundred feet in diameter; and within it are arranged, as at Stonehenge, two smaller circles, set in the manner before described. Here also is a central stone of immense size which appears to have once subserved the purpose of an altar for religious worship. The avenues to each of these structures, are still distinctly visible in the plain below, though the intervening centuries must have done much

to obliterate them. There can be little doubt that these remains were originally places of Druidic worship. Bones of deer and oxen are found in abundance in and around them; indicating that sacrifices were frequently offered there.

The cromlech is a much smaller structure than the gorsedd. It commonly consists of a large flat stone resting on several supporters. One of these remains, found but a short distance from Brecknock, is constructed as follows: Three rude stones are firmly set in the ground at the three points of a rectangular triangle; and on the top of these lies a large flat stone eight feet long and four in width. On all of these stones are drawn a number of strange characters never yet deciphered. In the surrounding area is found a number of smaller stones, though now so disarranged as to render their relation to the rest, a matter of much uncertainty.

A much larger cromlech is still standing near Pentrev Ivan, in the county of Pembroke. Here, as in the former instance, are found three perpendicular stones about ten feet in height; and on these, a flat stone eighteen feet by nine. Near by is another flat stone, about ten feet by five, which is supposed to have been broken off from the former. Around this central group, arranged in the form of an arc, are seven other upright stones, which appear to have been part of the original structure. Many other specimens of the cromlech have been found in different parts of Wales and England. It is now generally conceded, that they were constructed and employed as altars for public sacrifice. No examination of them has ever led to the discovery of any other design. It is quite probable that they were intended for this purpose alone.

The cistvaen is commonly a space enclosed by four stones, arranged like the sides of a chest, and surmounted by a horizontal slab as a lid or cover. A group of five such structures, set in order around what was once a large cromlech, is found near Newport. The lids of these chests vary from ten to thirteen feet in length, and are of corresponding width. Within the enclosed spaces have been found ashes, particles of bone, pieces of earthen ware, and other similar articles. In some other instances, these chests have been discovered to contain bones of men and animals, human skulls and hair, and even the entire skeletons of men. These structures are very numerous; and sometimes of enormous size. One is found, the parts of which

are supposed to weigh from twenty to twenty-five tons. They were once supposed to be the graves of distinguished chieftains; but no certain indications of such a use have as yet been discovered. Their ordinary position, near some cromlech or gorse-d, and the material commonly found in them, lead rather to the conclusion that they were employed either as minor altars, or for some other purpose in the Druidic worship.

The question respecting the origin of this educational, political and religious system, is deserving of some notice. Beyond a doubt, it is to be viewed as a reproduction on European soil of some gigantic system, cherished by these barbaric tribes before they had abandoned their oriental home. It may have been some stupendous scheme of idolatry, resembling, in the main, the Buddhism or the Brahminism of Eastern Asia. It may have been, as the author of the *Celtic Researches* affirms, some degenerate form of that primal religion implanted by the Deity in the heart of the race, and which continued to shed a dim but mellow light long after the full orb of truth had sunk below the horizon. But, whatever its parentage, it was certainly oriental. Borlase, in attempting to prove this point, has drawn out a somewhat striking parallel between the British Druids and the Persian Magi. Other writers have instituted a similar comparison between this order and both the Jewish and the Roman priesthood. And, though these writers often fail to establish the special point on which they are insisting, they still furnish ample and satisfactory foundations for this general conclusion.

It is also probable that the Druids had existed in Gaul and Britain for several centuries anterior to the Christian era. At the time of the first Roman invasion, they had reached the height of their popularity and influence. But, as fast as the Romans extended their conquests, and introduced a new style of civilization, the importance of the order gradually declined. The Roman leaders, finding in them their most determined enemies, and seeing that both princes and people were constantly incited by them to fiercer resistance, adopted most vigorous measures for their extirpation. They erected Roman temples, and compelled those whom they had subjugated to frequent them. They forbade the observance of Druidic rites and ceremonies, and severely punished all who transgressed their requisition. They deprived the Druids of all authority in civil affairs, and, so far as practicable, of all social or religious influence. Under such rigid

regulations as these, the order soon lost much of their original preëminence.

A still more destructive crusade was carried on by Suetonius Paulinus, in the reign of Nero. Leading an army against Mona, the grand centre of the order, he made himself master of the island; drove away or destroyed its former possessors; cut down their sacred groves, and overturned their structures for religious worship. This was a vital stroke. The spirit of the order was broken; and their influence soon declined. They retired to certain sections of Wales and Ireland, where they retained for some centuries a feeble hold upon the native inhabitants. Little by little, like the state of society in which they lived, they faded away; until at length, in the introduction of a higher civilization, the very traces of their existence became extinct.

Some general thoughts, connected with the present investigation, will close this somewhat protracted Article. The vast extent of the influence exerted by the Druidic order, and the peculiar qualities of that influence, require us to make it a subject of special consideration. Hume affirms, that no idolatrous worship ever attained such an ascendancy over mankind, as that of the ancient Gauls and Britons. Ramsay declares, that no system of superstition was ever more fearful; none ever better calculated to impress ignorance with awful terror, or to extort implicit confidence from a deluded people. When the ministers of a prevailing religion undertake to exercise an influence in social and civil affairs, that influence is usually indirect, and easily counteracted. But when any such body of men grasp the triple sceptre of dominion, and control at the same time the intellectual, the political, and the religious interests of any people, their power becomes tremendous and dreadful. Whenever such a phenomenon occurs in an enlightened state, where the evils attendant upon it will surely be seen and counteracted, the view excites at once our detestation and our fear. But we are scarcely able to realize how much more dangerous and detestible such consolidated influence becomes among an uncultured people, where there is far less power of resistance, and where the tendencies to superstition and submission are far more strong and universal.

Care should be taken, however, to view the influence of this priestly order from a proper point of observation. The Druids are not to be tried by the standard of more modern times. They

lived in a barbarous age; a period when almost every ray of that earlier revelation, that came from Eden and from Sinai, had been dissipated by the fogs of a formal Judaism; and when the clearer revelation, which came by Jesus Christ, had not yet begun to dawn. Not even the partial civilization of Egypt or Syria, of Greece or Rome, had penetrated the wilds of Northern Europe. All the light which shone on that worse than Egyptian darkness, came, unassisted, from within. It may, therefore, well befit us, on whom the true light now shineth, to be generous in our estimate, and lenient in our judgment, of this remarkable body of men. Great as were their deficiencies, and fatal as were their errors, we shall be, when we fully appreciate their circumstances, far more ready to pity than to blame.

That great and grievous evils grew out of this system, cannot be denied. All knowledge, religious as well as secular, was shut up within the sacred enclosure of the order. Their political intrigues were often productive of the most hurtful consequences. Their judicial decisions were often marked by injustice, and their penal enactments by the severest cruelty. They kept from all, except a favored few, the scanty knowledge of religious truth which they themselves possessed. They threw around religion the mystic veil of superstition; they overloaded it with senseless rites and ceremonies. They ruled alike by their despotic power the vassal and the prince; none was too low, and none too high, to be their subject. That these were great and grievous evils is manifest. And they are evils necessarily incident to such a system. They are its direct and legitimate fruits. Wherever in the progress of humanity such a body of men, possessing such powers and exalted to such a supremacy, have appeared on the stage of life, their appearance has necessarily been connected with such calamities as these.

Still, it should not be supposed or asserted, that the influence of the Druidic order was entirely and exclusively injurious. Macaulay has wisely remarked, that a society, sunk in ignorance and ruled by mere physical force, has great occasion to rejoice when a class, of which the influence is intellectual and moral, rises to ascendancy. The sway of intellectual and moral power, even when embodied in such men as the ancient Druids, is better than the sway of corporeal energy. It was better for the tribes of Britain, half barbarian, and fitted only to be vassals to some higher race, to be subjected to the domination of their

priesthood rather than to the tyranny of their uncultured princes. Though it be certain, that the priesthood were lordly and exacting, it must be borne in mind, that the rulers were lordly and exacting also. The Druids at least did something toward disseminating knowledge, and introducing a higher style of humanity among the people. They established a system of jurisprudence which, all full of errors though it was, was far preferable to the mandate of a sovereign, or the judgment of ungoverned passion. They cultivated, in some degree, a religious instinct, which, without any guidance, might have played itself out in still ruder and grosser forms. They added dignity to human life, and solemnity to human action, by connecting them with another and retributive state of being.

But Druidism is especially interesting, when it is contemplated in its relation to our own times; as being one of those primary forces, that have combined to form the British character. The influence of such systems lives and acts, long after the representations of them have passed off the stage; even after the systems themselves have been forgotten. Some of the elements, deposited in it by the Druidic order, are still visible, as they have always been visible, in the character of the Welsh people. All the power of the Roman and the Saxon invasion could not drive them out. All the energies of Christianity have failed to eradicate them. The student of Welsh history from the fifth to the twelfth century is constantly impressed with this fact. The poetry of that era, especially that of Taliesin, Aneurin and Llywarch Hen, abounds in allusions drawn from the Druidic system. Many of the laws of that period have clear marks of a Druidic origin. The prevalent opinions and superstitions of the nation seem to have sprung from that ancient stock. Even their views of Christianity were tinged by the Druidic element. And, if we descend to later times, we are still confronted by the same fact. The modern bards of Wales still preserve, with undiminished love, that metrical system which, though perfected at subsequent periods, had its origin in those days when Druidic science was taught in the antique triplet, entitled *Englyn Milwr*. Many of those quaint fancies and superstitions, extant in the mountainous districts of the principality, are fragments of Druidic lore. Nor have twenty centuries of change and revolution, even with all that Christianity has accomplished among them, been able to eradicate the affection for Druidism from the heart of the nation.

The contemplation of such a class of men as the order of British Druids, cannot fail to be of service to any serious mind. No one, who loves the study of humanity, in whatever form it may display itself; no one, who is interested in those great primal movements, by which human society has been brought to its present stage of progress; and, especially, no one who loves the Christian religion, and traces with delight its immeasurable superiority over every scheme of human devising, can rise from such a contemplation without being quickened and profited thereby. If the present survey of Druidism, necessarily abbreviated and condensed even to dryness, shall have in any manner contributed to such a result, the labor laid out in its preparation will be amply rewarded.

ARTICLE III.

CASTE IN THE ISLAND OF CEYLON.

By Rev. Benjamin C. Meigs, Rev. Daniel Poor, D. D., and Rev. William W. Holland, Missionaries of the A. B. C. F. M. in Ceylon.

It is not difficult to define caste, as set forth in the Shastras of the Hindús, or as it originally existed, and perhaps still exists, on the Continent of India. But caste, as it exists in this Province, has been greatly modified by many causes, which have been long in operation. For three centuries and a half, the people have been under the dominion of the Portuguese, the Dutch, and the English. All these governments did much, if not to exterminate, at least greatly to modify caste. Many of the people have, for a long period, been familiar with many of the truths and forms of Christianity. And, though caste still has an existence among us, it has been so modified, by these and other causes, that some of its original features are now scarcely visible.

In answering the question, *What is Caste?* (as it exists on the Continent of India), we cannot do better than to give the following extract from a document published by the Madras Missionary Conference, in 1850. It is as follows:

"Caste, which is a distinction among the Hindûs, founded upon supposed birth-purity and impurity, is in its nature essentially a religious institution, and not a mere civil distinction. The Institutes of Menu and other Shastras regard the division of the people into four castes, as of Divine appointment. We find, also, that stringent laws were enacted for upholding this important part of the Hindû religion. Future rewards are decreed to those who retain it, and future punishments to those who violate it. The Hindûs of the present day believe, that the preservation or loss of caste deeply affects their future destiny. In the Madras Memorial to the Supreme Government, dated April 2, 1845, they declare that the loss of caste is connected with the vitality of the Hindû religion.

"On the scale of caste, wealth, talents, industry, and moral character, confer no elevation; and the absence of these imposes no degradation. It is ceremonial pollution alone, which destroys it. This may be conveyed to a person of high caste through the sight, the taste, or the touch of one of an inferior grade. Such an institution, therefore, can never be called a mere civil distinction; for, whatever it may have been in its origin, it is now adopted as an essential part of the Hindû religion."

This is, undoubtedly, a correct definition of caste, where it exists in its purity. But a concise history of its developments, as it has come before us in this Province, will show how greatly it has been modified by the causes above mentioned, and in how few particulars caste, as it exists here, is correctly delineated by the definition quoted above.

The strict notion of birth-purity, or impurity, in a religious sense, as defined in the above extract, is not, so far as we can ascertain, very generally believed in this Province. The Brahmins, and probably some others, believe it; and there are, probably, some indefinite notions on this point still lingering in the minds of many. But the Brahmins in this Province are comparatively few; and, as a body, they have ever stood aloof from Christian instructions, and claim a maintenance from the people on the ground of their being incarnate divinities. Their claims, however, on this ground, are admitted by the people only to a limited extent, as their whole demeanor towards them sufficiently shows. Brahmins on the Continent make light of the pretensions of Brahmins in Ceylon, because, as they affirm, their continental

ancestors, by crossing the sea, and taking food under such circumstances, lost their caste-purity. On the other hand, the Ceylon Brahmins very justly affirm, on the authority of the Shastras, that the continental Brahmins have undeniably vitiated their caste by serving as magistrates, interpreters, writers, and in various other secular employments, for a livelihood; and that, too, in the service of foreigners of an unclean race, the Europeans. In our remarks, therefore, upon this subject, we may well leave the Brahmins, on both sides of the water, out of the question; both because they have pronounced sentence upon each other; and because we, in Ceylon, have no Brahmins in our mission communities, either in our churches, or in our service, as school masters or native assistants.

But, though little is said in this Province of "birth-purity or impurity," which on the Continent is considered so essential to the Hindû doctrine of caste, yet on other grounds much is said of pure or impure caste, or classes of society. In this, regard is had, not merely to their birth, but to their diet and regimen, corresponding customs and manners, their social avocations, intellectual habits, and religious employments. Between the two extremes of the pure Sivan, on the one hand, who rigidly confines himself to a simple vegetable diet—consequently abstaining from everything that has had animal life—down to the Pariah, on the other hand, who is unscrupulous about his food, sometimes eating even carrion, and using intoxicating drinks, with corresponding habits and customs; the Hindû population is divided into numerous classes, irrespective of caste-distinctions. Sivans, for instance, who are vegetarians, are generally of the Vellala caste. But all Vellalas are not Sivans, nor are all Sivans Vellalas. Those who eat only shrimps, account themselves superior to those who eat fish; and those who eat only shrimps and fish, superior to those who eat eggs and fowls. Thus on, indefinitely, downward to the Pariah. Thus, without any very prevalent belief in "birth-purity or impurity" in this Province, there are substantial grounds for the distinctions of pure or impure classes. And they also maintain their claims to purity of caste on the ground of their customs, secular avocations, intellectual habits and religious employments, as mentioned above. One obvious reason for the absence of the strict Hindû notion of caste, in this Province, arises from the fact, that the doctrine of the Bible, regarding the origin of the human race, is here very

extensively known. This arises from the fact before mentioned, that the people have for so long a period been under the control of powerful Christian governments. The Dutch, especially, used systematic measures, on a large scale, to instruct the youth, and to convert the Hindûs to the Christian faith. In the early part of the eighteenth century, nearly the whole of the rising generation of males were embodied in schools, established and sustained by the Dutch government. In the Elementary Catechism, universally used in these schools, the history of Adam and Eve, and of their immediate descendants, is given. Even to this day we occasionally meet with a man of great age, who will repeat to us the old Dutch Catechism, a great part of which we early incorporated into the Elementary Catechism now in use in our schools. But this Scripture doctrine, so far as it is admitted, is wholly subversive of the Hindû doctrine of caste. We have never known any individual who belonged to our church, who did not profess fully to believe the Scripture doctrine on this subject.

What, then, is caste in *Jaffna*?

As a general definition, we may say, that caste in *Jaffna* is a perpetuation of caste and caste-institutions from the Continent, modified by a combination of causes incidental to foreign immigration and colonization; under the rule, in the first instance, of revolutionizing and conquering native princes; and, subsequently, for a long period, under the reign of three of the most powerful governments of Europe, each of which, in its own peculiar way and manner, did much for the transformation of the native inhabitants. Hence, it is not strange, that caste should be so greatly modified in this Province. But let us not be misunderstood. It still exists, even here, and shows its sharp and ugly horns and cloven feet in the midst of us. We wish we were not compelled to add, that we see and feel its baneful influence in some of the members of our churches. It is, indeed, a prominent and troublesome feature of Hindû society, ever presenting obstacles of various kinds to the progress of Christianity. The nature and tendency of the institution is unsocial, forbidding and aristocratic; pervading all castes and classes of society, and quite as manifest in the low caste, as in the high; each caste, as they suppose, having some peculiar grounds for boasting.

That we may further elucidate the subject, it is necessary that

we proceed to give some of the results of our own experience and observations on the subject; and then show by what means Hindû caste has been so greatly modified in Jaffna; and also, to what transforming influences it is still subjected.

Before coming to this country, we had formed our ideas of caste in India mainly by what we had read in the journals of early missionaries in Bengal — Carey, Marshman, Ward, and others; and of course our minds were much awake to the importance of “breaking caste” in the mission field, especially as we were led to understand that it might be broken by so trifling a circumstance as that of partaking of a meal in a missionary’s house. One of our first encounters with caste, which happened a few days after our arrival in 1816, was a trifling incident in connection with a horse-keeper. On his being directed to do something in adjusting the furniture about the house, he refused to obey, saying it was contrary to his caste to do the work. But, as we could not tolerate caste on our premises, we told him he must obey or quit our service. To the latter he very readily assented, leaving the missionary to take care of his own horse, as there was no other horse-keeper in the parish. This was the first of a series of events, by which we became gradually acquainted with the state of persons and things in the country, in relation to caste. By this we were taught, that it was quite impracticable, without sails, oars or steam, to propel *our* frail bark against the prevailing monsoon! And surely there can be no marvel that it should thus happen to the much frailer bark of timid, recently converted Hindûs.

After a few weeks’ residence, we commenced a day school on our premises, taught by a young man who was formerly a pupil in Mr. Palm’s school. This man was able to bring to the school a few children belonging to his own family circle; but the neighbors generally considered it polluting and vitiating to caste for their children to come and learn on our premises. As soon, however, as the practice, by slow degrees, became common in the parish, all fears on the subject of caste vanished.

From and after the year 1818, we passed through a similar process in the admission of boys to our boarding schools. This very novel procedure produced a deeper sensation of alarm in the public mind, than that produced by bringing children into our day school; consequently our progress was much slower, and more difficult. Eating and drinking on the premises of

Christians, was thought to be utterly destructive to the children's caste, and a disgrace to their parents. In process of time, however, after many were committed to the practice who *could* keep each other in countenance, and when it was seen that their children were not changed into Englishmen, or Portuguese, but were much improved in body and mind, their fears on the subject of caste gradually subsided, leaving us to prosecute this branch of missionary labor to as great an extent as we thought proper.

A still deeper tone of alarm was sounded, when we began to receive girls into our boarding schools. But this, also, gradually died away, as harmless as in the case of boys, leaving us to prosecute our plans at pleasure.

From the ideas we then entertained on the subject of "breaking caste," and even from what we had recently learned from the talk of the people, we thought it most incongruous that any in either of our boarding schools should ever boast themselves of caste. We had "broken" and "killed" it. But in process of time we were called to "break" it and "kill" it again. And we resolutely did it. In the "Central boarding school" at Tillipally, then under the care of Mr. Woodward, in the year 1824 or 1825, it was ascertained that there were low-caste boys in the school. This was an offence to certain of the Vellalas, who made an attempt to have low-caste boys removed; declaring that, though they might with impunity eat with persons of their own caste on mission premises, they could not and would not eat with those of an inferior caste. This controversy led, ultimately, to the expulsion of three or four of the oldest and most influential high-caste boys in the school. They soon, however, saw reason to repent of their conduct, and humbly sought and obtained admission to the school.

In 1821, when it became known that the two first converts from Hindûism, members of our boarding school, were about to be received into the church, so strong was the opposition to such a procedure, that we had reason to expect violent attempts would be made to rescue one of the candidates. The occasion, however, passed off without disturbance, and was one of great interest in the history of the mission. It was, indeed, a strange sight to the spectators, to see two of their countrymen, of the Vellala caste, not only publicly eating and drinking with foreigners, but partaking with them from the same cup and plate. This was something in advance of all that had been previously witnessed

as an outrage upon caste-principle ; and was quite sufficient, we should suppose, to stamp the young novitiates as outcasts from Hindûism. Some apology was, however, made for them by their heathen relatives, that the boys were young, and knew not what they were doing. But a further advance was soon made, and another severe blow inflicted upon caste, when, at the close of the same year, two adult converts from heathenism, who were men of different castes, were admitted to the church, and sat down together at the table of the Lord. Subsequently another, and yet another fatal blow was inflicted, when females, first from our boarding school, and then adult women, were publicly admitted to the church by baptism, and thus led to commune with persons of different castes and occupations. At our great meeting in 1826, when we admitted candidates from our several stations, at a large central bungalow in Santillipy, prepared for the purpose, there were still more decided and daring manifestations of opposition on the part of relatives. The elder brother of one of the candidates stood up in the meeting, and boisterously protested against his brother being received into the church. But the presence of a police officer prevented open violence. In January, 1821, when the first professed convert from Hindûism was about to be received into the church at Batticotta, so strong was the opposition of his relatives that they carried him off by force the day before he was to have been received, and kept him in close confinement for some time. We might easily multiply examples of this kind, but the above are sufficient.

As substitutes for further specifications, we may observe generally, that, for thirty years past, hundreds of pupils of both sexes, and of different castes, have been boarded and educated in our two seminaries, at Batticotta and Oodooville ; that, of the pupils thus instructed, about one hundred and twenty couples have been married, generally at Oodooville ; that, after the solemnization of the marriage in the church, and the partaking of a little fruit at the station, the bride and bridegroom repair, with their friends, to the house of their parents, who are mostly heathen, where a marriage feast is prepared for the friends and relatives of both parties, whether heathen or Christian, and without attempting to compel Christians to conform to the heathen ceremonies. Sometimes it happens, that the newly married couple take up their abode permanently at the house of one of their parents, sharing the homestead, it may be, with two or three other fami-

lies who are entirely heathen. It should be remarked here, however, that native Christians, when thus situated, are careful not to give unnecessary offence to their heathen relatives. In a very few cases our female pupils, who were members of the church, have married heathen husbands; and in many cases graduates from the seminary at Batticotta, whether church members or not, have married heathen wives. But we now hear little or nothing of caste being vitiated by these marriage alliances; and this, too, whether one or both of the parties after marriage live as Christians or otherwise.

When this state of things was related to our missionary brethren at Calcutta, they exclaimed with surprise, mingled with some degree of unbelief: "And will they talk of caste after that?" But the climax is yet to be stated. Franciscus Malayapa, a native assistant employed by the mission, and subsequently licensed by us as a native preacher, had adopted the European dress, before he came into our service. For a time, and for convenience sake, he boarded at the table of one of the mission families. His father-in-law, the Rev. Christian David (recently deceased at the age of eighty-one), was, for the space of forty years from the time of his adopting the European dress, in the habit of eating, whenever occasion offered, at the tables of the principal Europeans in the Island, beginning at the Governor's table in the days of General and Lady Brownrigg. But neither the father-in-law, nor the son-in-law supposed, for a moment, that they had lost or injured their caste. But, on the contrary, thought much of their caste, and that they had bettered their condition by intercourse with Europeans. Nor did the community at large cast them off because of their dress, or because of their connection with foreigners; though, when provoked to do it, they might mention these facts as a blot. And thus it is now with many, who had been educated at Batticotta, and who hold important offices in the country, some of whom adopted European customs. Under this aspect of the subject, we see that caste is indicative of one's ancestry, and that it is not a common and easy thing for a man, in this Province, to "break or lose caste."

We close this topic by giving prominence to the fact, that, notwithstanding the manifold aggressions we have made upon caste through the period of more than thirty years, there has been no case of native converts, whether young or old, male or female,

being wholly and finally cut off from the family circle, or unable to abide in the place wherein they were called, in consequence of their having broken caste by becoming Christians. We do not say that this would not have been the case, had the conduct of our native Christians been more offensive. In most cases they are very careful not to give offence to their heathen relatives; in some cases too much so. Weak as they are, it would not be strange if they frequently conform too much to the wishes of friends and relatives, who are still heathens.

We have, indeed, seen cases in which heathen wives have left their husbands for a little season; in which parents have shown great displeasure, and even banished their children from the house, for a time, because they were baptized and received into the Christian church; and very great annoyances have been experienced by native converts, especially in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, while living among their heathen relatives; and these difficulties were greater in former times than at present. But the fact of native converts, whether married or unmarried, being tolerated in the house and family of their heathen relatives, shows most clearly that caste, in the sense of the *Shastras*, has been greatly modified in this Province; and that "losing caste," is not here an easy or common thing.

We will now speak of what the *Hindûs* themselves have done, and are still doing, for the destruction of caste in this Province.

1. The continental Pandian kings, who formerly reigned in Jaffna, introduced a new caste into the Province, called *Madapalies*, the offspring of high-caste men with *Covia* women, who are a high caste of domestic slaves. This caste was endowed with certain perquisites and privileges, so that it now ranks among the high castes of the country, next below the *Vellala*. This caste cannot boast much of "birth purity," though they are not regarded as an impure caste. The caste of *Madapalies*, into which it is comparatively easy to get introduced, is not found among the ninety-six castes of Southern India, and is peculiar to this Province. But the introduction of a new caste, and one of so great importance, must manifestly vitiate the whole system of *Hindû* caste, as taught in the *Shastras*.

2. The *Hindûs* in this Province are destroying the remains of this evil system, by constantly rising from a lower to a higher caste. Such a process must of itself be as gross a violation of

the classic Hindû system of caste, as can well be conceived of. Methods of rising from one caste to another are various.

(1) By false entries, when persons remove from one place to another where their ancestors are not known.

(2) By bribing those who have charge of the registries in public offices, to insert their names in higher castes.

(3) This is done extensively by intermarriages.

This third method is deserving of some special illustration, as bearing extensively on the subject in hand, in relation to the higher castes. For example: two young men of the Vellala caste, graduates of the seminary at Batticotta, accepted large pecuniary offers from a man of wealth, but of lower caste, at Colombo, to marry his two daughters, both heathens and uneducated. The young men immediately proceeded to Colombo, and took possession of their prizes. Hitherto they have lived in good style and in credit, having employments suited to their education. Moreover, they are sustained by the public opinion of their countrymen, inasmuch as they have obtained a fair *quid pro quo*. The father-in-law made a good speculation, because his grand-children will be registered according to the rank of their father, as Vellalas. True, they will never cease to be taunted, when occasion may require it, that they are below par as to caste on their mother's side. But where large numbers of the community are similarly situated, there is not much room for reproach.

We now give a case of recent occurrence on the other side. A man of wealth and education, and high in office, in another part of the island, but of low caste, has purchased with a great sum the privilege of marrying the daughter of one of our schoolmasters of the Vellala caste, of the highest grade. By this the native gentleman is brought into alliance with the whole family circle of a superior caste; and this will in various ways be made to operate favorably upon his posterity. From these two cases, which are illustrative of what is extensively in progress in the country, it will be seen that caste, whatever it may be, is an article in the market, which may be turned into silver and gold, and consequently is of substantial value.

Under this aspect, caste may be regarded as an order of nobility, which may be shared by those who are in circumstances to make the purchase. Under such influences, however, caste must vary in its nature, and ultimately exhaust itself by expansion.

But alas for the nobility of caste! Causes are now in operation, in this Province, which tend to destroy the foundation on which caste, as a civil distinction, has hitherto rested its claims. In former times, under the native kings and princes, the Vellalas and Madapalies were privileged orders in the community; and the results of those privileges have operated favorably upon their posterity from generation to generation. But now, times have so altered, that "on the scale of wealth, talents, industry, and moral character," caste, whether in the Hindû sense of it, or as a civil distinction, can confer but little elevation, nor the absence of it impose but little degradation. This will more clearly appear as we proceed,

3. To show what the English government has done, both directly and indirectly, for the destruction of caste.

(1) By the abolition of slavery, which took place soon after our settlement in the island. By that important measure several castes, such as Covias, Pollas, Malavas, and others, were placed on a new footing in society, and are gradually rising towards an equality with their former masters in wealth, intelligence and importance.

(2) By disregarding, to a great extent, the claims of caste, and placing applicants for office on the high ground of personal qualification, trustworthiness, efficiency in business, etc., the government has wrought extensively and powerfully for good upon the whole native population, but most subversively to the claims of caste.

(3) By an effectual injunction upon European magistrates and native head-men not to enter the caste of individuals in public documents, such as suits at law, deeds, registries, jury-lists, etc., government is doing much to obliterate even the remembrance of caste distinctions from the public mind.

(4) By encouraging the sale of arrack and toddy, the government is doing much to destroy caste distinctions. Drunkenness is a great leveler. Even some of the Brahmins and Vellalas are becoming familiar with the use of intoxicating drinks, while some of the lower castes do not drink. Thus, while the low castes are rising, some of the high castes are falling by intemperance.

We will now present a few miscellaneous remarks on the peculiarities of caste in our mission field.

1. The three higher castes (leaving out the Brahmins), viz.

the Vellalas, Madapalies and Chitties, form a large majority of the population of the Province. Of these three castes, the Vellalas are far more numerous than the other two. As society was constructed under the rule of the native princes, the Vellalas were the agriculturists of the country, and in this Province the owners of the soil. As the lords of the country, they held most of the other castes in their service, by different tenures, and on different terms of service; a bond of union well understood by the parties, pervading the whole community, and binding them together by different interests. The two great divisions of these *under* classes were, *first*, The three castes of slaves that have been already mentioned; and, *secondly*, The Kudimakkal, that is, the blacksmiths, carpenters, barbers, washermen and goldsmiths of the country, including the Pariahs, who are tom-tom beaters, and drudges in various employments.

From the very beginning, we have opened our great commission to the whole population of the country, as far as our circumstances would allow; but it is a remarkable fact, which we cannot satisfactorily account for, and which is one of the most characteristic features of our mission-field, that the three higher castes, more especially the Vellalas, are almost exclusively the people who have opened unto us, and thus secured the advantages of our mission-labors. The Kudimakkals were from the beginning among our most constant hearers, daily, while employed in our service in week times, and weekly at church on the Sabbath; but, almost without exception, all this numerous class have rejected the Gospel, and but few of them have ever manifested an interest in sending their children to our common schools.

From these remarks we must except those of the Fisher caste, who are a people more independent of the Vellalas, and from whom a portion of our converts have been gathered. But the Vellalas are emphatically our people; and, notwithstanding the losses they have sustained by the freedom of their slaves, and by the introduction of the principles of liberty and equality in society, yet, combining the advantages of Christian instruction and of a superior education with the advantages which they inherited from their fathers, they will long continue to be the most thriving, energetic, intelligent and best behaved portion of the Tamil population. On this account it will continue to be a desideratum to belong to the Vellala caste.

2. Another feature of our mission-field bearing on the subject in hand is, that in most of the numerous and populous villages into which the whole Province is divided, the different castes are found in due proportion, while those of the same caste in the villages round, are more or less related to each other. On this account, and on account of the dense population of the whole Province, it will be physically impossible, even were it thought desirable, for us to separate them into Christian villages, as in Tinnevely, and in some other parts of the Continent.

We have made arrangements so to proceed in our work of disciplining the whole mass of the population, that every one may continue in the place wherein he was called with the least disturbance possible. This we consider as the dictate of wisdom and prudence, till they be made to understand what be the first principles of the oracles of God, the sum and substance of which is love to God and love to man. If, indeed, we could have whole villages of the same caste, we might prosecute our evangelical labors without rousing and stimulating some of the worst principles and passions of our fallen nature. But as it is, we think it not wise to disturb the present arrangements of society, except by the silent operations of the Gospel of Christ. We would make the most of the injunction: "Go home to thy friends, and tell how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee." And thus would we cause the people to understand, that excision from the family circle is not a necessary adjunct of one's becoming a Christian, but rather that he thereby becomes a better son, or brother, husband, or father, than before his conversion. We consider it safer, and a more satisfactory trial of one's sincerity, to live as a Christian among his friends, than to be separated from them in a Christian village.

3. We formerly thought the evils of caste arose chiefly from the unreasonable exactions and pressures of the higher upon the lower castes; and this was doubtless the case in former times. But one of the results of our observation while dealing with caste, as things now are, is, that the spirit of the low caste rising, is as much to be deprecated as the spirit of the high caste reigning. "For three things the earth is disquieted; yea, for four things which it cannot bear." One of the four is, "for a servant when he reigneth" (Prov. 30: 21). This point admits of extensive illustration from scenes and occurrences too familiar to our minds

to invite a recital, and, moreover, it is too obvious to require formal proof. We will, therefore, remark generally, as the result of our experience, that, since we have found by our adventures that the enemy with which we have to contend cannot be slain by carnal weapons, we are very slow to pitch battle, or to come into direct and hostile collision with caste, as we now find it in this Province. We are fully convinced there is a far "more excellent way" of dealing with it. More especially has this been the case since we have better understood the structure of Hindû society, and learned to what extent the different castes in this Province answer to the different classes of nobility, gentry, merchants, mechanics, farmers, and menial servants in Protestant Christendom.

The principal canon we would lay down on this subject is, to tolerate nothing within our control, which militates against our ruling the house of God, or watching over, guiding and disciplining the church of Christ, according to the law and directory which he himself has given us. "For now we live, if our churches stand fast in the Lord." If asked whether we do not allow persons to remain in our churches, who entertain erroneous views, or who give place to unhallowed feelings on the subject of caste, our reply is, that we do; but in the sense only in which we make recognition of the fact, that in all cases of regeneration the "old man" is destined to coexist simultaneously with the new, until, by a successful exercise of the ministry "for the perfecting of the saints," they "all come to the unity of the faith, into the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." "We have learned, by our experience and observation, that caste is a great evil; an evil which governs the religious emotions, tastes and habits of all the races of India; which is imbibed by the infant at the breast, and cherished with scrupulous anxiety through life; an evil which has been ingrained into the whole Hindû character, for well nigh three thousand years, so as to form the very cement of Hindûism." What then? By the preaching of the word to a man full-grown under the regimen above described, a ray of light and a principle of life have been imparted from Him who is "the light" and "the life of men." The giant caste-man has become, as we fondly hope, a man of God; but to such an extent a weakling, that he is like unto a "bruised reed and smoking flax." We submit the question, as to what are the appropriate instrumentalities by which we may in the first place unmake,

and then reform, this man of giant growth? Are there any appropriate appliances for this purpose but the Gospel ministry, the training and discipline of the Christian church, and the concurring influences of God, the Holy Ghost? The Bishop of Calcutta remarks: "In this diocese the first thing a catechumen does, is to reject caste *in toto*." What can this remark mean, in view of the foregoing description of the "giant evil?" Every Hindû, when he enters the Christian church by baptism, when he eats from the same plate and drinks from the same cup with those of an inferior grade, does to a certain extent renounce caste. He ought to do it "*in toto*." But his caste feelings and prejudices are not thereby wholly eradicated, and cannot be in a moment. It is a work of time. The appropriate means for abolishing caste, in every desirable sense of the expression, are, we believe, light and love on the part of the missionaries, docility and growth in piety on the part of the native converts, together with the promised influences of the Holy Spirit. All compulsory means used for this purpose, in which we cannot carry with us the judgment and consciences of those concerned, are generally disastrous to the assailants and the assailed; to the Christian church, and to the heathen population at large.

Having made the foregoing statements on the general subject of caste, we proceed to specify some facts with regard to our treatment of caste in our churches, and among our church members in the walks of private and social life.

We have never allowed caste in our churches. We have never allowed any separate communion for high and low castes, as was formerly the custom in Southern India. All our members, both high and low caste, have, from the beginning, drank wine from the same cup, and eaten bread from the same plate, and this promiscuously.

That we may show what is our treatment of caste in the walks of private and social life, it is necessary for us to indicate briefly to what extent there is and must be a non-interference between the missionaries and the families of their converts. In endeavoring to give some further information on this subject, we remark, that a Hindû, find him where you will, may justly be defined to be an embodiment of rites and observances peculiar to the Hindû race. These observances, customs and manners, may be divided into three classes.

1. Nationalities, or that which is common to all castes and classes.

2. Idolatrous observances.

3. Caste distinctions and usages.

Of these three classes the first has the greatest, and the last, perhaps, the least prominence in the general characteristics of the nation, and more especially so in relation to the point under consideration; that is, in the walks of private and social life. We do not, in our social intercourse with them, readily recognize the respective castes beyond our own personal acquaintance, and beyond what may be known by the fact that several of the lower castes are, from their very positions in society, low, untidy and repulsive. On this ground, whatever may have been the cause of their degradation, there is as substantial a distinction of castes or classes, which cannot but be observed, as between the sons of noblemen and the children of the "ragged schools" of England. A distinct recognition of this fact is of fundamental importance in all attempts to bring or to push the extremes of society to associate, and especially to eat together, in private houses.

We will now give a few specimens of nationalities, studiously avoiding all that appertains either to caste distinctions or idolatrous observances.

1. The Hindûs have no *home*, in our sense of the word; no place where the family come familiarly together, in a social way, where they may be seen. When we visit a family, we do not enter the house, but tarry without, either in the yard or the veranda, and speak with those who make their appearance. This we do, either standing, or seated on an inverted rice mortar, or in some other position. All are interested to know the specific object, for which the missionary has come to the premises; but their sense of propriety and good manners do not require the family to assemble. Even Christian families are slow to make their appearance, although called. As Hindûs, they ought not to appear at all, but continue in the house and at their work. Those Christian families in which both husband and wife have been educated in our boarding schools, are far in advance of their countrymen. Still, they are but Hindûs in a state of gradual transition, and living, it may be, in the houses of their parents.

2. For very good reasons, we do not encourage, even in our boarding schools, any important changes of the native customs

of the Hindûs, in regard to dress, manner of living, mode of sitting, furnishing their houses, etc. In all these particulars there are some improvements, but no imitation of European manners and customs. Such an imitation would be adverse to the great object we have in view, of operating upon the mass of the population through the agency of the educated classes. If even the educated should adopt the European dress, and other concomitant customs, they would lose credit in the estimation of their countrymen, and be subjected to fourfold greater expenses, with less of real comfort and independence of life and character.

3. The uneducated Hindû does not ordinarily make use of chairs, tables, bedsteads, etc., seeing that the whole ground-floor of the house, with appropriate matting, is available for all these purposes. And what, in their view, is the use of crockery, knives and forks, and spoons, and the whole profusion of table furniture, seeing that a few articles of earthen ware for cooking rice and curry, a brass pot for water, and a garden with plantain leaves for plates, with his own right hand for a spoon, are a full supply in this line of service? The act of eating is a rite and ceremony to be performed in private. Even men are not willing to be seen eating by any one who does not join them in the act. But for a woman to allow herself to be seen eating, would be a positive disgrace. In this vulgar exercise the right hand is so deeply involved, and so important is it that the business be finished at a sitting, that the most menial servant has a substantial reason for turning a deaf ear to his master's call, or thinks it sufficient if his master knows that he is eating. How then can the wife possibly eat with her husband and children, and male guests, while she is mistress of the ceremonies? European wives may do this, as they have domestics to wait upon the table. Custom has made it the duty of the wife to deal out the rice and curry, and to bring water for drinking and washing after the meal is finished. But while the Hindû woman may not be seen eating common food, she may be seen enjoying the betel leaf and areca nut as an honorary repast.

It is a nationality, also, that sons who are beyond early childhood, do not converse freely with their father, nor even with others in their father's presence. Nor should an elder and a younger brother sit in public on the same mat or seat, nor should a son-in-law speak with his mother-in-law, nor a father-in-law be present with his daughter-in-law, etc. These are mere speci-

mens of nationalities, common to all castes; and most of them are more rigidly observed by those who would be accounted the higher grades of society.

Again, when we are visited by the natives, it is generally either in the way of business, or of attendance at religious meetings, or of private instructions; and then, with a few exceptions, they are seated on a mat, as is customary with them at their own houses, and in the church of God. Occasionally our native preachers and a few others sit on chairs at our tables, and partake with us of a cup of tea, fruit, bread, etc.

Many other instances might be given of customs, which are mere nationalities, and which have no particular connection with caste. Indeed, we find a practical difficulty in attempting to separate purely caste distinctions, in the customs of social life, from mere nationalities; and it is even more difficult in the mind of a native. Even Christians are prone to plead for customs, which we believe are contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, that they are mere nationalities; while the unconverted Hindû sees no more propriety in our requiring a convert to break or renounce his caste, than to break or renounce other nationalities.

By the specimens of nationalities, which we have given above, it will be readily understood that it cannot be expected that we, as foreigners, whose customs and manners we would not have them imitate, should act the part of reformers of the Hindûs "in the walks of private and social life," except so far as these customs are contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. But, while we thus speak of the great gulf of nationalities, which separate us from the people, we rejoice to be able to say, that we have a growing esteem for and an increasing attachment to the Hindû nation as our people, and as a people to be made ready for the Lord. Many of them will, we doubt not, be a crown of rejoicing in the day of the Lord Jesus, to those who labor with fidelity and perseverance for their conversion. Even now, and with blest anticipations, we come into close contact with them, holding constant and delightful intercourse with both the rising and the risen generation, on all subjects appertaining to the great object of our residence among them.

If the questions be proposed: "How far are the Continental castes, and the castes on the Island, alike? And why do you not treat caste as they do on the Continent?" we must, in answer to the first, commence by saying, that, with one exception, we

have none of us, for any length of time, resided on the Continent, and are, therefore, quite unable to do justice to this subject. Our local and intimate knowledge of caste, as it exists there, is not sufficient to enable us to make a definite and exact comparison. But we have in fact said many things in the former part of this Article which are an appropriate answer to the question. In the quotation which we made from the Madras Document, will be seen a very carefully worded definition of caste, as it is supposed to exist on the Continent. And, by comparing this with the statements we have made as to caste, as we find it in this Province, it will be clearly perceived, that it has already, by various causes, been greatly modified; and, especially, that there are now many causes in operation tending powerfully and rapidly to do away with the evil.

But, "Why do you not treat caste as they do on the Continent?" We have already stated facts to show that our circumstances, with respect to this evil, differ widely from those of missionaries laboring on the Continent. But we will say:

1. That we believe it is not proper for us to legislate upon this subject for the members of our churches, to compel the high castes to do violence to all their views of propriety, by eating in the houses of those of low caste, or to intermarry with them. But we have, from the commencement of our mission to the present time, used all Scriptural arguments against the distinctions of caste, and we think with great effect. It is hardly necessary for us to repeat, that we have never allowed any distinctions of caste in our churches. Different castes have also been in the habit of eating together in our boarding schools. Many of our native assistants, in certain circumstances, will cheerfully eat with those of lower castes, especially when on tours. At our Annual Convocation, in September, at Batticotta, provision is made for all our church members, and very many of different castes eat together on that occasion; not by compulsion, but willingly. Our native assistants, also, most cheerfully go among the low castes, preach the Gospel, and superintend schools. They also assist them in sickness, and at funerals. But, to make a law, compelling the high castes to eat in the houses of low castes, or to intermarry with them, would be more abhorrent to their feelings and all their views of propriety, than for a law to be passed for the churches in New York or Boston, compelling the rich to receive their servants, both black and white, to their

tables. We do not believe that it is proper for us to legislate upon this subject.

2. We should not accomplish the object we have in view. Our object is to destroy caste, and especially to root it out of the minds of our native converts. Now it is a well-known fact, that many native assistants and schoolmasters, rather than lose their employment, and be thrown into great pecuniary embarrassment, will comply, for the time being, with the demands of the missionaries to eat food prepared by low castes; and they justify themselves in this matter, and their friends also excuse them and overlook it, simply because they are compelled to do it, or sacrifice their living. But is the caste principle thus extinguished, or even diminished in their breasts? We think not. We do not believe that leviathan is thus tamed.

3. This course is productive of positive evils. It sours their minds; and its tendency is to make our members act hypocritically in this matter. Unless we can enlighten their minds, and carry their consciences with us, we gain nothing but their displeasure. We do not accomplish our object. For the caste feeling in their minds is rather strengthened, than diminished, by this course. We will encourage them, and help them in every possible way to do away with the evils of caste; and we fully believe that the only proper way of accomplishing this object is by light and love, and example, and the power of the Spirit of God. By the diligent use of these means, in connection with what the government is doing on this subject, we believe that caste is rapidly losing ground in this Province. How long it will linger, we cannot say. But this we do know, by long experience, that it cannot be killed by violence.

We see clearly, that it is the natural tendency of the Gospel to elevate the low castes to a level with the high, rather than to bring down the high castes to a level with the low; and this it will in due time accomplish. It will certainly, also, teach the high castes to treat their brethren below them with Christian kindness and love.

ARTICLE IV.

CHRISTIAN CHARACTER A POWER IN THE REDEMPTION OF THE WORLD.

By Austin Phelps, Professor at Andover.

THE last years in the life of Isaiah were chiefly engrossed by visions of the closing periods in the earthly career of the Church of Christ. This should seem to have resulted as much from the instinct of his religious feelings, as from the prompting of the prophetic impulse. The prophet is sometimes lost in the man, when he turns away from the disorders and idolatries and miseries of his own day, to contemplate, with the chastened enthusiasm of age, the happier times when Christ should reign over all lands. It is congenial with the feelings of all good men to anticipate thus the events of a better age than their own. It conduces often to the acquisition of just views of duty, to propose the inquiry: What would be the result, if certain changes predicted in the Word of God, should now or soon take place?

It is for the sake of such an inquiry, that attention is invited to a principle suggested by the twelfth and thirteenth verses of the fifty-first Psalm: "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free spirit. Then will I teach transgressors thy ways; and sinners shall be converted unto thee."¹ This is the language of hope in the depth of religious humiliation. It expresses the conviction of the Psalmist, that his own restoration to the favor of God, involving, as it would, the improvement of his own character, would be followed by the increased success of religion throughout his dominions. The principle implied in this conviction, is one which probably all enlightened Christians will recognize, as entering largely into God's plan for this world's recovery. In its broad application, the principle is, that the rapidity of progress in the salvation of this world is, by God's plan of procedure, proportioned to the

¹ This Article was originally prepared as a Discourse, and, in substance, delivered before the General Association of Massachusetts at Yarmouth, on the evening of the 29th of June, 1853; and it was repeated on the 4th of the September following, in the Chapel of the Theological Seminary at Andover, as a Valedictory Address to the Senior Class.

degree of piety existing among those who have already been made subjects of Divine grace. In other words it may be stated thus: That the success of sanctifying power does, in God's plan, enlarge the *range* of regenerating power.

This principle, it may be assumed, does not need a defence here. It lies at the foundation of all that is peculiar to *Christian* benevolence. It is implied in every consistent theory of *Christian* missions. It underlies all intelligent effort to extend, in any manner, the knowledge and the power of *Christian* truth. It is, indeed, so well understood and so unquestionably conceded, in the convictions of probably the large majority of *Christians*, that its significance often escapes appreciation. It falls back into the rank of those truths whose lot often is, to be unfelt *because of their importance*. The very magnitude of such truths burdens a finite mind in the conception of them. Imagination grows weary in the effort to follow them to their consequences. The sensibilities shrink back in impotence, from receiving them as efficient realities. We recoil from the mental pains of the discipline which would be requisite to render them the nuclei of an earnest religious experience. The result often is, that we talk of such truths, like dreamers. They are the theme of much glib but unmeaning exhortation. Between our dialect and our experience with regard to them, there is apt to be a strange incoherency. We *know* not that of which we affirm. It often becomes a duty, therefore, to sit down to a reëxamination of them, worn out though they be, as themes of intellectual conception. We need to admonish ourselves yet again, of the significance of that which we believe. We need to enter into a homely calculation, of the height and the depth and the length and the breadth of the faith we hold. It will do us no harm, if such a calculation should chance to diminish somewhat an imaginative fervor. We shall be the gainers by it, in point of truthfulness, of calm earnestness, of fixedness in principle, — in short, of everything that enters into the structure of a manly *Christian* character. Especially is this true, in respect of those doctrines of our faith which concern the closing ages of this world, and the position of the Church of Christ in God's plan for the world's redemption. We make a hopeful advance in *Christian* experience, when a living faith on these subjects — no more and no less than is plainly warranted by God's word and providence — takes the place of dreams and romance.

Let the truthfulness, then, of the principle which has been evolved from the inspired language before us, be assumed, and upon it let the simple inquiry be instituted: *What would be the result to the enterprise of the world's redemption, if any great increase should take place in the present energy of Christian character within the Church?*

To place the inquiry, and the hypothesis upon which it is founded, in the most distinct light, let it be supposed, that the vast numbers whose names are enrolled as spiritual Christians, should develop a perceptible and rapid growth of personal character. Let a movement be visible, from the present level of Christian experience to one more elevated and more uniform. Let the mass of Christian mind now thinking, praying, acting, on the earth, be raised to a higher eminence in moral discipline. Let the common faith of Christians take to itself a new depth of conviction. Let Christian love grow into the possession of a more keen and more steady sensibility than it now exhibits. Let Christian purpose assume a new dignity of aim and strength of will. Let Christian character as commonly exhibited to the world in real life, settle into the compactness of more consistent principle. Let it part with many of its present excrescences, and exhibit that "beauty of holiness" which springs from symmetry of proportion. Let the common Christian mind rise towards that point of almost finished culture which is now reached only by a few, whose names will go down to remote generations, preserved by the reverence which the world cannot but choose to pay to superior virtue. Suppose such a change in the character of the church of Christ to have taken place, or to be distinctly perceptible in rapid progress. The supposition, surely, is not visionary. It has nothing of the aspect of romance to the eye of a Scriptural faith. It is a supposition which the sober history of the church is destined yet to realize. Let us, then, suppose it to have already taken place, far on, if we please, in those remote ages which are the subject of yet obscure prophecy, yet, let it assume for the hour, the distinctness and the glow and the magnitude of an existing reality; and then let the inquiry be: How must the progress of God's plans for the conversion of this world be affected, in consequence? In reply to this inquiry, it is proposed to consider the subject in illustration of three positions. .

In the first place, such a change as is here supposed, would

result in a development within the church, of now latent resources of moral power.

Scarcely any conviction will impress itself more distinctly on the mind of a thoughtful Christian, in contemplating the church as the instrument of the world's conversion, than that of the existence, in the church, of *latent* energy. In one point of view, no better description can be given, in few words, of the church as a Power in human society, than this, — that it is an immense assemblage of undeveloped resources: It is a power, the strength of which has never yet been fully awakened. It has never been fairly represented in the conflict of destiny which, from the beginning, has convulsed this world. With all that has been done and all that is now doing, to bring the moral influence of the church to bear, at its height, on the progress of the race, it still has, in the main, the aspect of a *reserved force*, whose "hour has not yet come."

It would be interesting to observe, more at length than it can be done here, some details in illustration of this fact. The estimate has been made by some who have had extensive means of information, and whose minds have been much directed to the philosophical view of the relations existing between the church and the world, that not more than one fifth of all who bear the name of Protestant Christians, add anything of *perceptible* importance to the efficiency of the church, in the work of the world's conversion. This opinion is quoted here, not for the purpose of defending it, but as an illustration of the view which some conscientious minds have felt obliged to take on this subject. With whatever limitations the opinion might be adopted, no doubt can exist that a large proportion of the power which the church might exert, instrumentally, for the dissemination of the Gospel, is yet undeveloped. It exists in a dormant state.

Among other things in proof of this, the following positions will readily occur, as capable of being established beyond a reasonable doubt. One is, that the actual results of Christian influence now exerted on the world, bear no comparison to the representations which the Scriptures give of the efficiency of the church in its best state. This will be self-evident to any attentive reader of the prophecies. Another is, that, assuming the early history of the church as a standard, a disproportion is obvious, between the numbers and wealth and intelligence and social rank of the church now, and the actual results of her influ-

ence on the world. This assertion is not made, to support all the impressions sometimes entertained of the exalted character of the church in apostolic times, nor the inference hastily drawn, that the church of modern times has, all things considered, retrograded from the apostolic experience. But, so much as this is undeniable, that the extension of the Gospel in the world then, considered relatively to the apparent resources of the church, was more rapid, than the further extension of the same Gospel now is, as compared with the apparent resources which the church now has at her disposal. It is not a fair inference from this, that, *all* things considered, the church has retrograded, but it is a fair inference, that resources now exist in it which are not developed. We look back to the successes of the first preachers of Christ with a feeling of awe. Those successes appear to us almost like a series of miracles. They remind us of the lost arts. It would sometimes appear, as if certain elements of power had, in a dark age, disappeared from the system of the truth we preach, and that no skill nor happy accident of modern civilization had led to their re-discovery. Another fact which might easily be established on this subject, is, that the same resources which are now in possession of the church, if brought into action for *other* objects than those of Christian benevolence, would exhibit a greater efficiency than they now seem to possess. That is to say, that, if any other body of men possessed the numbers, and the wealth, and the intelligence, and the social position, and the facilities for organization, which are now found in the church, and should throw such resources into a work for any other object than the progress of the Gospel, they would exhibit an efficiency in operation, that is unknown in any of the enterprises which Christian zeal has set on foot for the world's conversion.

Making all necessary allowances in the comparison, for difference in the grandeur and in the difficulty of objects, and, therefore, for difference in the legitimate tests of success, it still cannot be doubted, that human energy in this world reaches its mightiest achievements, when put forth in the service of evil. Force of human character finds its most athletic illustrations in the bad passions. The human soul has developed more power in cultivating and strengthening and organizing and concentrating sin, than in destroying it. We know well the energies of the human mind in its unsanctified exertions. It finds no barriers in mountains and oceans. It acknowledges no restraint from institutions

which are the growth of a thousand years. It luxuriates in the destruction of empires. It laughs in the van of armies. Some of the most terrible displays of its energy, too, have been under the domination and in the service of false religions. The world will not soon forget the false prophet of Arabia, nor Peter the Hermit. Yet no revolution the world ever witnessed, in the arts, or in science, or in government, or in human forms of religion, had such resources to support it as those which, by the institution of *The Church*, God has given to the work of the world's conversion.

These positions might easily be illustrated, if the present object required it, but they may properly be assumed. And they tend to impress on our minds this conviction, that there is within the church of Christ a greatness of moral strength, which has never yet appeared in any results that have been achieved, in giving to the Gospel ascendancy in the world.

Now, upon the supposition which has been advanced, of an extensive elevation of Christian character, above its present average, we cannot but admit that, simultaneously with such a change, and in proportion to its rate of progress, a development of this latent energy in the work of this world's conversion, would take place. The result would follow with all the certainty of a decree of God. We are apt to lose the force of our most truthful convictions on this subject, through a failure to appreciate all that is involved in such a change as is here supposed. To one mind, the change most readily suggests itself in the form of a mere increase of religious fervor; possibly, of an increased frequency of periodic excitements. To another, it suggests the idea of a mere consolidation of religious opinion; possibly, of a more severe dogmatism of belief. To a third, it suggests the mere multiplication of personal labors in Christian action; possibly, of novel modes of action and schemes of organization. To a fourth, it portrays itself as a mere expansion of pecuniary resource, which should pour the wealth of the church into the coffers of religious enterprise. But the truth is, that neither one nor all of these aspects of the change supposed, do really represent it, either in its intrinsic magnitude or in its results. Back of all these, we discern the true nature of such a change, in the simple fact that it is a *growth of character*. It is not merely speculative, nor merely emotive, nor merely executive, in its nature. It is all these, but more than all and beneath all, it is a

growth of personal character: This is plainly what we mean, when we speak of an increase of piety. Translated from the dialect of the pulpit, it stands side by side with certain other changes of human character. As realized in the individual, it is a growth of character, just as manhood is a growth upon juvenile mind. As realized in large masses of society, it is a growth of character, just as civilization is a growth upon barbarism. When we speak of the development of latent energy as resulting from the change which has been supposed, we must conceive of it as that unfolding of moral power which, under God's plan, always and inevitably springs from wide-spread *growth of character*. It is the power of *mind*, enlarged and invigorated by a sanctified discipline. It is multiform in its manifestations, but one in its nature. The church thus invigorated, becomes, in the plans of Divine grace, what a dominant people like the Romans, or a dominant race like the Anglo-Saxon, is, in the plans of Divine providence. Dominion is given to it, from sea to sea.

With such a view of the nature of the change contemplated in the supposition before us, it is not difficult to conceive of some of the modes in which the augmented resources of the church would manifest themselves, in the work of disseminating the Gospel. Among the *least* of the fruits of such a change would be, that hoarded treasures should be poured forth, and buried talents should be exhumed, in tribute to the acknowledged purposes of God in the world's conversion. A new life would be breathed into *all* the modes in which Christian character exhibits itself as a power in the world. The common Christian mind would come under the more intense influence of its Christian faith, as if that faith were a new revelation. All present moulds of uninspired Christian thought would be recast. Forms of belief which in many minds are now lifeless, would glow again with more than their youthful vitality. Words which, as now used on the lips of many, have slipped their sense, would recover the burden of significance which they once bore as God's message to the world. The pulpit, and with it all other media of Christian speech, would breathe the spirit of an apostolic presence. Christian views of life and its objects, would be expressed to the world more vividly than now, in Christian practice. Christian example would be less extensively, than now, dwarfed by petty scrupulosity, and deformed by corresponding inconsistency in weightier matters. It would be enlarged in its range of graces.

It would be extended in its reach of influence; and this, because it would be ennobled and intensified in its hidden spirit. Piety would, more generally than now, partake of the element of magnanimity in character. Its zeal, welling up from a deeper heart, would be of more generous and chrystalline quality. Its fidelity would have less of mercantile and diplomatic shrewdness, and more of the simplicity of love unconscious of its own greatness. Its defence of the faith, would not be weakened, as now, by contracted aims, and oblique tactics, and treachery to the cause of honor. It would appeal to the great, the noble, the highminded, the heroic. It would draw to itself, by a more imperative attraction, that spirit of *obeisance*, with which the world in its infancy regarded physical greatness; and afterwards military prowess; and later still, royal birth; and which it now, with singular inconsistency, divides in tribute to wealth, on the one hand, and to literary genius, on the other. The moral dominion of this world, so far as it is in any sense wielded by any human power, must change hands, just as soon and as rapidly as the church of Christ shall become prepared, through Divine grace, to receive it. All forms of material power must give it up. Even intellectual greatness must become subaltern. The dominion must pass over to Christian virtue. Thus, He whose right it is, shall reign.

The view here advanced, of the development of latent energies through an increase of character, is not a singular one. It is not peculiar to the experience of religious minds. It is often illustrated in the achievements of those who attain to eminence in secular history. We read of changes of character in certain individuals whose names the world of the past has handed down to us reverently; changes occurring in the meridian or the decline of life, which forcibly remind us of what would be the nature and results of similar change in Christian character. It is recorded of the Spanish Conqueror of Mexico, that, when he was fairly embarked upon the schemes of conquest over which he had long dreamed, and when the romance of adventure began to deepen in his mind into the grandeur of achievement, a change came over his whole spirit and deportment. From that hour he became like a man of whom one great thought had taken possession. That one thought, he regarded it as the single object of his life, to work out in action. That one thought expressed the problem of his existence. To solve it, was the object for which

he had been created. It affected his whole being. It recast the very features of his countenance. It changed the look of his eye. It infused itself into the carriage of his body when he walked. It breathed itself forth in incoherent hints when he lay down to his brief slumbers. His thoughts, the historian tells us, ceased to evaporate as they had formerly done, "in empty levities and idle flashes of merriment." "His elastic spirits were shown in cheering and stimulating the companions of his toilsome duties, and he was roused to a generous enthusiasm, of which even those who knew him best had not conceived him capable." "With his gayest humor, there mingled a settled air of resolution, which made those who approached him feel they must obey; and which infused something like awe into the attachment of his most devoted followers."¹ From that hour of change in the man, began the development of that almost superhuman energy in action, which has made him, in sober history, the prince of the heroes of romance. Such is the awakening of latent forces, when any human mind comes under the dominion of new conceptions of great objects. Those conceptions engender a new volume of motive power.

Awakenings not unlike this, have taken place in Christian experience. Such an awakening occurred in the early ministerial life of Philip Doddridge, and also in that of Robert Hall. It does not appear certain, indeed, that the change in the character of Dr. Chalmers, which revolutionized his ministry, and which is commonly regarded as his conversion, was not rather a development of previously existing religious principle. It gave him distinct premonition of its approach. "I feel myself," he said, not long before that remarkable change, "I feel myself to be on the eve of some decisive transformation in point of religious sentiment." And he received the premonition with a reverence of spirit, which *may have been* the instinct of piety, already disturbed in its slumbers, and springing at the footfall of that Power which was approaching to awaken it, and gird it with strength. Such awakenings must take place throughout the vast mass of Christian mind, whenever the dayspring of a holier age shall dawn on the world.

Passing, now, to another topic embraced in the inquiry before us, we observe a second result which would follow from any general elevation of religious character in the church, in the fact

¹ Prescott's Conquest of Mexico, Vol. I. pp. 246, 259.

that the resources of the church for the work of the world's conversion, would be *relieved from many existing hindrances to their operation.*

It is the remark of Isaac Taylor, respecting the modern movements of Christian enterprise, that "in the preparation and arrangement and government of our evangelic institutions, we have too slenderly admitted the principles of human prudence." This may be true; but it is equally true that many things which at the first view appear to indicate imprudence in the prosecution of our work, are in fact the necessary evils attendant upon an imperfect development of Christian energy. It is the misfortune of all human benevolence, that, to just that degree in which it is imperfectly developed, it infuses into its plans the means of its own counteraction. This often becomes the more obvious as its plans become enlarged. Those whose minds have been long conversant with the interior of our modern system of evangelical enterprise, cannot but be sensible of the existence of hindrances to success, arising from this cause. We do seem, often, to labor at a disadvantage which is not the necessary consequence of anything inseparable from the nature of our work. It results from the imperfection of the instrumentality employed. On the broad scale of observation, it does sometimes appear as if the scheme of Christian benevolence must contain within itself the elements of its own defeat. The looseness of its structure appears at so many points; the feebleness of its operation is so frequently disclosed; devices from which much has been hoped, so often fail in the very juncture in which their success has seemed indispensable; and our trust in our plans is so often proved to have rested upon an inflated credit; that it becomes, at length, an illustration of God's power, that He *can* employ such instrumentalities without hazard to his own decrees. Even an uninterested looker-on must discern, in the practical working of our institutions, evidences of greater friction than is needful for steadiness of movement, and of a great expenditure of force often, for scarcely visible results.

To set this point in distinct relief, let several things be specified, as illustrations of hindrances to the free working of even the best plans, that have yet been devised, for the maintenance and dissemination of the Gospel.

And here, lest the manner in which these hindrances are named should seem to indicate a censorious criticism, it may be

proper to express the conviction which we doubtless have reason to entertain, that, probably, the church of Christ, as compared with the church of any past age, is now in its palmy days. It cannot be proved that the time has ever yet been, when, *all* things considered, there was more in the character or plans or exertions of the church, that betokened the presence of God, than exists at this moment. They inquire not wisely who say, "the former times were better than these." It is right that we should humbly believe this, and, praising God for it, take courage. Yet, for this very reason, we should be the better able to bear the disclosure of defects which embarrass our work, and mar the symmetry of its results.

Let it be observed, then, that a hindrance to the success of our religious organizations is found in the fact, that pecuniary contributions to the cause of Christ flow, to so great an extent, from — something else than religious principle. The conviction cannot easily be resisted, that, to a considerable extent, a very intricate complication of motives does overlay, if it does not displace, Christian simplicity, in the contributions of the treasures of the church to the support of the Gospel. To say nothing of the prevalence of a merely impulsive benevolence, we have too much reason to suspect the play of secondary, even of frivolous, and often of positively sinful motives, in the outlay of pecuniary resources for this object. The pecuniary sacrifices of the church, are probably the least valuable index of its Christian character. Could all the secrets of religious charity be known, we should have some sad pages to acknowledge, in this chapter of Christian experience. Even the regenerated human heart has many hidden chords of which it would scarcely confess the ownership. They must be played upon long, and by skilful fingers, before that heart will give forth a full response to the claims of Christ's cause upon its treasure. Pecuniary liberality is too often a weakling among the graces. It needs to be nursed with feminine adroitness. Its caprices must be watched, and foreseen, and humored delicately, like the nerves of a sick man. It has, therefore, become a complicated art, to obtain the requisite funds for the support of religious institutions. It involves the invention, and the management, and the frequent change, of an intricate machinery of appliances. It requires a rare order of diplomatic talents, in those to whose office it falls. They constitute a distinct profession. Men of great power in other

departments of the service, might be by no means equal to mediocrity in this. Many a man can, in the pulpit, hold breathless audiences in suspense upon his lips, or can rule synods in stormy debate, or can write a book which shall instruct and fascinate another generation, and yet, if we should place that man at the head of the financial department of a missionary society, or send him on the circuit of an obscure agency in its behalf, he might not be able to save the treasury for which he should be responsible, from bankruptcy. Now, it cannot but be regarded as a hindrance to the working of our present system of beneficence, that money for its support *must be* raised with so much of external pressure, that it must come to its objects as the fruit of so much inferior motive, and that it is not safe to trust to the spontaneous and steady offerings of Christian principle, that cause which belongs to Him, whose is the silver and the gold and the cattle on a thousand hills. That will be a glad day for the church and for the world, when we can afford, in this respect, to simplify our policy.

Another illustration of the hindrances to which our system of Christian effort is exposed, is the fact that its working is complicated with disputed questions of social reform. It is a phenomenon, in the providence of God, well worthy of our study, that, just at the time when Christian benevolence is expanding itself to meet the demands of all nations for the word of God, the social philanthropy of nominally Christian lands should be permitted to assume some forms of hostility to the church; and that, even *within* the church itself, evidences of this hostility should appear; and specially, that our churches and our missionary organizations should be made the rallying points where different theories of social reform come together in conflict, and clamor for adjustment. The wisdom of man would scarcely have ordered things just so. If it must needs be that contentions arise, among good men equally earnest and equally honest in their convictions on matters of reform, we certainly should not have chosen just such a field for their battle-ground. As respects the common work of the world's conversion, we must regard such a complication with the local questions of the age, as in itself an evil. It is an incumbrance upon our evangelical policy. Admitting it to be a necessity, yet that very *necessity* is the evil. It does create a side issue in almost all our plans of Christian action. It does practically divert into lateral channels a vast amount of emotive

and executive energy, which might otherwise flow on in the central work. Grave thoughts are suggested, when we see some of the most important ecclesiastical Conventions and Associations and Conferences and Assemblies of the land, year after year suspending somewhat of their internal harmony, and somewhat, also, of their fellowship with each other, upon the single point of their ability to agree on questions which, in a broad view, are at the best but the provincial, not the world-wide, not the *imperial*, questions in the problem of this world's destiny. Grave fears are excited, when we see the *missions* of the age thus held in abeyance to the *reforms* of the age; the *conversion* of the world thus subordinated to the *reorganization* of the world. We have reason to tremble, when Christian coöperation in even the preaching of the Gospel, and in the maintenance of Christian worship, is made to hang in perilous and "dancing balance" upon the pivot of a compromise. It may be, that this is a necessity created by the pressure of existing differences of opinion — and we may have reason to praise God for the Christian wisdom which does hold together so many independent minds — yet, let it be repeated, that very *necessity* is an evil; it is a drawback upon the efficiency of our religious institutions, and upon all broadcast plans of Christian effort. The tendency of it is to separation, to isolation, to alienation. That it does not produce these results in greater degree, is owing to the fact, that so much of Christian energy is rallied to ward them off; and *just so much* of Christian energy is, by this necessity, abstracted from the common cause. That will be a happy day for the church, when questions of social reform shall be so adjusted in the structure of Christian opinion, that they shall no more embarrass the distinctive enterprises of Christian benevolence.

A third illustration of the hindrances to which the modern system of Christian effort is exposed, is the fact that the popular taste within the church is sometimes perverted, as respects the importance and the true methods of preaching. It is of comparatively little moment, how much or how little is done for the maintenance and extension of the church in other modes, if erroneous tastes pervade it respecting the pulpit. Perversion at this point deranges our whole system of beneficence. We have reason, therefore, to look with apprehension upon even partial and temporary errors on this subject. Just so far and so long as they exist, they constitute a drain upon our moral energy,

which nothing but their correction can arrest. Yet it is no censorious charge to say that such errors do exist.

Sometimes they exist in forms of direct degradation of the pulpit. One theory of the ministerial office — a theory deliberately and conscientiously held — represents it as chiefly an office of vicarious duty. Its great work is not so much instruction as mediation. The preacher is merged in the priest, and the pulpit is hidden by the altar. This theory is to a certain extent recognized by the popular taste. It is recognized in fact, sometimes, when in form it is rejected. We too often encounter in our churches, a disposition to exalt the devotional parts of public religious services, at the expense of preaching. This error is sometimes unconsciously confessed in the very structure of our church edifices, in which a diminutive and bashful pulpit seems to sink down in maidenly affright beneath a huge brazen organ, located, in defiance of all taste, directly in its rear. The tendency sometimes becomes regnant in a community, to permit the pulpit, if it will, to drop silently out of sight, amidst the multitude of other instrumentalities more imposing to the senses. Some would have us appeal to the religious sensibilities of the world, chiefly, not by the dulness of sermons, but by the stateliness of forms, by the associations of sacred places, by the significance of sacerdotal or of classic costume, by the beauty of a liturgy, by the solemn fascinations of music, by the "pageantries which chant their way through cloistered aisles," and by the vaulted roofs and massive columns and dimly gorgeous windows of an architecture which never could have been *originated*, in an age of faithful and successful preaching. A learned Poet-laureate of Great Britain, speaking of the pulpit of that country, not more than twenty-five years ago, used the following language: "There are hardly more than half a dozen pulpits in the kingdom, in which an eloquent preacher would not be out of his place. It is not in the pulpit that a minister can do the most good. Sunday is the day of his least labor and least important duty. The pulpit is a clergyman's parade." "The time employed in making a sermon, would be better occupied in adapting to a congregation a dozen of them, written by your predecessors." Now, this to our ears is simply ludicrous; yet, it is a legitimate result of much which a popular taste often asks for in the regulation of the services of the sanctuary, and which, it must be confessed, a too pliant ministry sometimes grants.

Another form of perverted taste respecting the preaching of the Gospel, may be regarded as a rank offshoot of *poetic* sentiment. It does not degrade the pulpit as considered relatively to other objects of the sanctuary, but it claims from the pulpit, the preaching chiefly of the poetry of religion. To such a taste, the voice of a charmer in God's house, is the pleasant voice of one whose chief aim in preaching is to set forth the elegances of religious sentiment, rather than the foundations and the pillars and the bulwarks of religious conviction. He is one who addresses himself chiefly to the sense of the beautiful. He throws around the forms of all truth, the drapery of an exuberant imagination. If he does not silently drop out of his treasury the sterner doctrines of grace, he casts them into the alembic of a deceitful fancy, till their rigid and ungainly forms dissolve themselves into images of beauty. Forms flinty and jagged, and which God *meant* to be flinty and jagged, are metamorphosed into tropic birds whose plumage dazzles but for the moment, as they take their flight. The reigning taste of a people will sometimes demand, that the more severe of the doctrines of grace, be virtually suppressed in the pulpit, so far at least as concerns the honest and *thorough* discussion of them. An effeminate taste sometimes creeps in by stealth, especially into cities and populous towns and their environs; a taste which is nauseated by so manly a diet. "Preach unto us smooth things," is the demand; "prophesy deceits; sing unto us a lovely song; play well upon thy many-stringed instrument; ring pleasant changes upon thy blithe harp; then shall the rich and the refined and the noble gather in admiring crowds at the bidding of thy minstrelsy, and thy name shall be enrolled among the magnates of the land."

Still another variety of perverted taste respecting the true methods of preaching, is one which would virtually suppress in the pulpit all discussion of difficult combinations of truth, upon the plea, that they are not suited to impress the sensibilities of the popular mind. "I think," said one of the dignitaries of the church of England, in a famous "Letter to a Young Clergyman," "I think the clergy have well-nigh given over perplexing themselves and their hearers with abstruse points of predestination, election and *the like* — at least, it is time they should." This opinion is a fair representative of a popular taste, which is not always so ingenuously expressed. They who come under its

dominion, turn their backs upon the preacher, who has the hardihood to make argumentative vigor the distinguishing characteristic of his pulpit. They hasten away trippingly from him whose letters are weighty, containing some things hard to be understood. Their nimble feet have borne them beyond hearing, before he, in his simplicity, deems it necessary to remind them of One who had the temerity to reason in the synagogue, even *every* Sabbath. They mutter against such a preacher insinuations of the antiquity of his theme, and the arid quality of his logic. The more intelligent of them are fond of associating systematic divinity with the dialect of trigonometry; and a few deem it their good fortune, to be able to quote from the *Paradise Lost*, and render Milton responsible for their conviction that

“Reasonings high of providence, foreknowledge, will and fate,”

are unfit themes for a Christian pulpit, since they once stirred the debates of Pandemonium.

Let us not be understood as confounding this error with a certain healthful antipathy, which the best of religious minds cherish against what is designated, vaguely, we think, as “intellectual preaching,” and more discriminately as “scholastic preaching.” Those who are familiar with the variations of popular feeling in reference to the pulpit, will not find it difficult to distinguish this antipathy from the one which is here condemned as a perverted taste. Yet, in the popular experience, they lie side by side, and an unconscious transition from one to the other is not uncommon. Unguarded censure of scholasticism in the ministrations of the pulpit, often generates hostility to *all* vigorous developments of *mind* in preaching. The instinct of piety, which justly starts up against the pomp and the lordliness of *intellect* triumphing over *sensibility* in the aims of the pulpit, often lends itself, unconsciously, to a noxious *inertness* of mind, in both preaching and hearing. The form of perverted taste thus created speaks, therefore, in a strain of mingled conscientiousness and — mental indolence. “Preach unto us,” is its language, as a wise preacher will interpret it, “preach unto us a more practical religion. Come unto us in the simplicity of thy vocation. Be not ambitious of lofty themes. Lay aside the models of our stalwart fathers, and condescend to the lowliness of our diminutive stature. Help us to lay again and again, and still again, and yet once more, the foundations of repentance. Creep with us yet

among the first principles of the oracles of God. Teach us, as one would amuse children, with a story. Exhort us with long suffering. Play, by novel measures, upon our exhausted sensibilities. Tempt our heavy eyelids by the conceits of thy ingenuity, and the noise of thy shoutings. Thus shall the blessing of the foolish and the indolent be upon thee, and they shall be an exceeding great multitude who shall hail thee as an apostle and a prophet."

The existence, to a certain extent, of these and other similar perversions of taste respecting the true power of the pulpit, is scarcely questionable. The tendency to them is specially rife in commercial countries, and in periods of great commercial prosperity, when the accumulation of wealth, with its temptations to luxury, gives to cities an unhealthful sway in the social economy, and gathers around the church in such countries the perils of a mental and moral effeminacy. Now, just so far as such effeminate tastes infect the common Christian sentiment with regard to the pulpit, so far the moral energy of the church, in any and every enterprise for its own extension, is sapped at its foundation. Wealth may be poured out like water. The architecture of our churches may display the munificence of princes. Our clergy may dwell in king's palaces. Missionary treasuries may be filled as with the profusion of old chivalry. Benevolent societies may be as the stars in number, and popular enthusiasm may mount to ecstasy at the appeals from our platforms. Denominations may marshal their strength in vieing with each other for the endowment of church extension. And to the wealth, and the enterprise, and the social respectability, and the gorgeous refinement of the Christian fraternity, may be added the dignity of swelling numbers, and the force of a splendid organization; so that it shall seem, to a worldly criticism, to be no vain boast in the humblest of the brotherhood to say, in the language of a living scholar, "I thank God that I am the child of a *magnificent* Church." Yet, let vitiated tastes corrupt the simplicity, and degrade the authority, and emasculate the manliness of the pulpit, and all this show of Christian energy soon becomes but a tawdry parade. Real life is taken out of it. It ceases to be respectable. In God's sight, it becomes detestable. An old Roman Triumph had a far more manly significance.

To just that extent to which this process goes on, *in part*, the moral power of the church over the world evaporates. Let such

a process approach its consummation, and the result would be seen in the general corruption of the church, from which nothing could save us but the signal interposition of God, which should be to the church in such a condition, what the advent of Christ was to Judaism; what the Reformation was to Romanism; what Puritanism was to the English hierarchy; and what Methodism was to a later death-sleep in the English church. We may confidently say to the churches of our land: 'Your dangers and safeguards, as respects theological *heresy*, are not chiefly in the hands of your theological schoolmen. They are in the hands of your preachers, and back of them, in your own tastes and the demands you make upon the pulpit. Demand for your pulpits manly and Godly preachers; ask them of God, and demand them of man, and then *sustain* them by your own tastes respecting the quality of preaching, and be assured, you shall *never* have an unsound ministry — NEVER.'

The views just presented would lead us naturally to consider, if the limits of this discussion would permit, a fourth illustration of the hindrances against which our system of Christian effort sometimes labors. It is the fact of an apparent inability, on the part of the church, to mingle, in any high degree, the spirit of trust in God, with that of a just self-reliance, in the work of extending the institutions of the Gospel. The point of chief interest in the development of this fact is, that Christian activity, historically considered, exhibits a vibration between successes and reverses; reverse being often necessary, apparently, to check an inflated spirit which had been engendered by success. Our human weakness has seemed to need just such discipline. The height of success in the dissemination of the Gospel is commonly of short duration, and often our great work has almost appeared as if suspended for the better training of those to whom its execution has been entrusted. Like the Hebrews in the wilderness, we wander through decades of years, in apparent uselessness, before energy of character reaches the magnitude requisite for effective conquest.

Passing this particular with this brief allusion, and returning now to the object for which these specifications of hindrances to our system of Christian effort have been named, let us observe that the thing which is needed to relieve the work of this world's conversion from such hindrances to its progress, is a general advance in Christian character. Could such a change as we

have supposed, take place, these obstructions would be, in great part, removed. They would be, doubtless, removed to just that extent, which should correspond with the degree of improved discipline in the state of the common Christian mind. From their very nature, they could not exist in a perfectly developed Christian society; and any approach to such a state of society, is an approach to their destruction. The point of special moment, however, is, that, under God's plan of procedure, nothing else than the change here supposed will result in their removal. They will not be removed by miracle. They cannot be removed by the mere increase of the numbers of the church, nor by merely an improved policy in the management of our Christian organizations, nor by the mere accumulation of wealth in Christian hands, nor by the mere increase of active Christian zeal. They cannot be reached effectually by any one avenue of approach. They are not the proper objects of any single class of expedients. Indeed, they are not subject to the power of any expedients. The power needed to accomplish their removal is, like the power of vegetation in Spring, the resultant of hidden forces. It is the power of enlarged character. It is the spontaneous and irresistible force of Christian mind, energized by the grace of God. The conviction forces itself upon one who contemplates intelligently the most serious of these incumbrances upon the mission of God's people to the world, that they are not superficial incumbrances. They cannot be shaken off at will. They have roots running deep in human nature. The changes that shall destroy them must be elemental. They throw back our hopes from all human expedients upon that almighty and undying grace, which shall make God's people willing, in the day of His power.

We have still to notice, briefly, a third result which might be expected to follow a general elevation of Christian character in the church. It is, that *concentration would be given to the moral power of the church by improved modes of Christian union*. It is scarcely necessary to speak of the waste of energy, which has resulted from divisions among those who bear in common the Christian name. It is the great argument, which never can be answered to the satisfaction of an infidel, that the church, from the time when its numbers first attracted the attention of the world, has always been, to human view, a distracted body. It is a phenomenon which the great majority of the world cannot be made to understand, in any way that shall be creditable to

Christian character, that the lives of so many able men should have been expended, the force of so much Christian feeling should have been absorbed, and the edge of zeal for the common cause should have been so frequently turned, in conflicts, often violent and in the result tyrannical, between those whose real differences, if there be any truth in their common faith, have long since been lost sight of in heaven. It is impossible to explain, by any philosophy that shall save us from reproach, why religious discussion, if sustained by large combinations of Christians, should almost always degenerate into contention, and differences of opinion ensure mutual hostility. Yet, by common consent, the fact seems to be confessed, that the evil is not accessible by any policy that has yet been devised. The wisdom of expedients does not reach it. All experiments in the way of visible Christian union, on an extensive scale, appear to be doomed to failure. All our lamentations over our dissensions, are so fruitless that it is not singular if our enemies pronounce them heartless. It requires a charitable ear to detect in them the deep voice of Christian love. They too often sound like the wailing at an Oriental funeral. At no single point in the whole range of our present economy, does the necessity of an enlarged growth of Christian character come to view more palpably than in this. The lapse of time only deepens the conviction that the consummation which all desire, none should desire to hope for, but as the result of a new baptism from on high.

Our own day bears witness on this subject, no less significantly than other times. Is not one of the chief embarrassments we experience in sustaining our religious institutions, the difficulty we encounter in regulating the denominational spirit? Do we not find this spirit to be a perilous virtue? Is it not true, that the more vigorous we become in numbers and in wealth and in social position, the more tensely are the lines of denominational distinction drawn? Do not the influences that stimulate growth seem to be wholly *astrigent*? Perhaps the most remarkable phenomenon of all, to a looker on, is the fact that, the confessedly common work of sending the Gospel to the destitute, is made itself the occasion of separations. Our missionary organizations become the very centres of divergence. We exhibit the paradox in action, of "abrogating plans of union," for the sake of increased efficiency.

It becomes any individual to speak, on this subject, with great

deference to the general voice of two intelligent denominations, which has been unequivocally expressed. But to the fathers and brethren, whose wisdom it is an honor to their juniors to trust, the utterance of an honest doubt as to such a policy may be safely ventured. It surely cannot be charged to the account of indifference or of ignorance, if it appears to many, an unintelligible policy. It cannot be ascribed to their timidity, if, in view of such a policy, they look upon the growth of the denominations most dear to them, with a trembling rather than an exulting sympathy. It is not an uncharitable distrust of their brethren, which leads them to fear the *remote* results of such modes of increase. Is it not true, that denominational growth may, after all, be delusive? May not church extension become but a noble name for ecclesiastical pillage? Is it not possible, that we may be found to have been of those who preach Christ of envy and of strife? Is there not danger that we may advance, by steps which we, or those who come after us, *must* retrace, before the millennium shall dawn on the world? If it prove not so, and if the policy in question prove to have been a necessary evil, which it was wise to choose rather than a greater, it still illustrates the need of an elevation of Christian character by which we should rise above such an *evil* necessity. We need, surely, to be able to prosecute the work of Christian missions, with united forces. The inquiry is a fair one, and the world will press it to the injury of the truth: if the work of this world's conversion cannot unite the body of Christ, what can do this? If Christians have not common ground here, where can they have it? The inquiry deserves notice, also, whether there is not more of the semblance than of the reality of truth, in the view, with which scruples on this subject are so often silenced, that fellowship of spirit may exist without union in action? We confess that we do not see in this principle the force which many ascribe to it. We have never been able to feel its sufficiency, as an answer to the taunts of infidelity. We are very sure that it cannot bear up the present structure of Christian denominations, with the superincumbent weight of their present policy in their treatment of each other. Can that be *Christian* fellowship which breaks, the moment it is tested by Christian action? Can that be Christian union, which vanishes the moment there is something to *do*? Does not such a union exhibit more of the courtesy of well-bred strangers, than of the sympathy of true-hearted brethren? Does it not spring

from the virtues of the gentleman, rather than of the Christian? On one of the roads leading to the summits of the Andes, there stands midway between the summit and the valley, a house of entertainment, where travellers meet and exchange congratulations; and it often happens that, while one party who have come up from the valley are shivering with cold, the other party who have come down from the mountain are fainting with heat. Though breathing for the time a common atmosphere, they have come from regions so diverse in their temperature, that it is as if the tropics and the poles had been compressed together. Is not such too often the character of the "fellowship" of Christian denominations which strive to sympathize with each other in feeling, while they part asunder in action? Is it not the fellowship of mere juxtaposition, rather than of union?

From whatever point of view, we regard the existing modes of Christian union, the conviction returns upon us, that any perceptible improvement of this union, must spring from some widely diffused influence that shall raise the tone of Christian character, and endue it with the graces of a more perfect discipline. Such an influence would of necessity enlarge the common Christian intellect, while it should deepen the flow of Christian love. Differences of opinion would, many of them, be smiled away, as men dismiss the prejudices of their youth. Others would be waived, as too unimportant to be debated on the field of action. Growth of character would accomplish, in this respect, that which mere argument can never do. Obstacles to fellowship would thus disappear, which never can be reasoned away, and the wonder would arise, not that they had ceased to be, but that they ever were. The church would find itself, in glad surprise, on heights of Zion, from which obstructions to Christian union should glide off to the right, and to the left, and before, and behind, as if melted by the breath of God.

Of the further suggestions of which this discussion is prolific, one can scarcely be unnoticed. It is that of the dignity of the Pastoral Office. The distinguished honor of that office is, to train churches of Christ, which are to be the pillars in the support of truth the world over. We are apt sometimes to overrate the relative importance of that which may be termed, in an unusual sense of the word, the *pioneer* work of the ministry. This is that work which has for its object, only the conversion of men

from a state of hostility to God; the work, it may be, of an evangelist, or an itinerant preacher, as distinct from a pastor. This work, intrinsically considered, cannot be overrated; but as related to the subsequent work of Christian training, it may be. He was not in the highest sense a wise pastor, though a singularly successful one, who sought a change in his field of labor, because nearly the whole body of his congregation had been hopefully regenerated by God's blessing upon his ministry. That pastor's work was then but begun, nobly begun indeed, still, only begun. The glory of the Christian ministry consists in that which distinguishes the Pastoral Office. It is the successful *culture* of regenerate souls. It is the accumulation in the church of Christian energy not merely, not chiefly, by the growth of numbers, but by the growth of character, by the enlargement of Christian mind, by its advanced intelligence, by its enlightened conscience, by its consolidated strength, by its expanded heart, by its wise and steady habits of action, by its perfected and confirmed possession of all that is lovely and of good report.

This view is supported by a remarkable feature in the policy (if so feeble a word may be thus used), which God has thus far adopted in the history of redemption. It is, that the work of this world's recovery has not been carried on by an equal diffusion of the light of truth through the earth. It has been by concentration, rather, of Divine favor upon choice localities. God has acted through the agency of a peculiar people. He has employed favorite nations. He has sought out countries, and discovered new lands, which He has chosen as His special resting places. There His honor has dwelt. There His presence has disclosed itself in His most stately goings. There have the riches of His grace been expended in Divine profusion. There have the altars burned with the most prompt and often repeated evidences of His blessing. And from these favored localities has gone forth the light in scattered rays, shooting obliquely here and there into the night that has shrouded the surrounding world. The principle of God's wisdom in all this, is that which we have been considering, and which indicates the illustrious office of the Christian pastor. It is, that in the choice of instruments in this world's redemption, God honors chiefly, not numbers, — else, Babylon should have been chosen rather than Judea; not wealth, — else, Tyre with its merchant princes had been preferred to Galilee and its fishermen; not noble birth, — else, patrician Rome had

taken precedence of Nazareth; not genius and learning, — else, Greece or Egypt had been the birthplace of Christ, rather than Palestine; and the apostles should have commenced their labors in Athens or Alexandria, instead of going first to the lost *sheep* of Israel, and beginning at Jerusalem. It is, that God honors in the choice of his instruments, those whom in His sovereign pleasure He has made the recipients of His own grace. Them He trains for His work. He disciplines them by long and varied culture. He pours out the full treasure of His love upon them. He purifies them unto Himself “a peculiar people, zealous of good works.”

In close alliance with this feature in the Divine plan, is the institution of the Pastoral Office. The tenor of its commission is: ‘Labor for the training of Christian churches. Study the state of Christian minds. Learn the idiosyncracies of Christian experience. Strive to enlarge the growth of Christian hearts by a wise culture. Feed the lambs of the fold. Make your name dear in Christian families. Magnify your office by vindicating, in your example, its permanence. Labor, by your life’s work, to build up monuments that shall live when you shall have entered into rest. Such labors shall bring your work into alliance with the costly, the stable, the far-reaching plans of Jehovah. Such a purpose spans the globe in its wise forecast. It has a prophetic eye, and looks into the remotest future. In the successes of the Gospel, in all lands and through all times, it discerns the consummation of its own honor, and the proof that it is ordained of God.’

ARTICLE V.

DID PAUL MODEL HIS LANGUAGE AFTER THAT OF DEMOSTHENES?

Translated from the German of Dr. Friedrich Köster of Stade.¹

THE late De Wette has pronounced it improbable that the Apostle Paul acquired any appreciable benefit from the old Hellenic learning and literature. In like manner, Winer affirms it to be "now pretty generally conceded, that no Greek culture can be ascribed to Paul, any more than to the Jews generally, who dwelt in Egypt and Palestine," although this language is qualified by the remark, that "he has, to be sure, a greater degree of skill in Greek style and composition than the other apostles (e. g. Peter and Matthew), which he probably obtained in Asia Minor, where his intercourse with native Greeks, many of whom were learned and distinguished men, was so extensive and intimate." We believe, however, that we must advance a step further, and admit the probability of his having not merely read, but become familiar with, several of the old Greek writers, and more particularly that he has modelled the language of his Epistles, to a considerable extent, upon the Orations of Demosthenes.

On account of the importance of this point to a correct judgment of the intellectual culture of the Apostle, and of the light it throws upon his character as an author, we shall endeavor to exhibit with more precision, the reasons which appear to us to speak in its favor.

And first, let us call attention to the course of his mental training from youth upwards. Paul was born, it is true, of Jewish parents, who dwelt, however, at Tarsus, a celebrated commercial city in Cilicia, in which Greek learning flourished; and, as his father had acquired the privileges of Roman citizenship, he would seem, to a considerable extent, to have overstepped the bounds of Jewish bigotry and exclusiveness. Judging from the analogy of the dispersed Jews generally, it is even possible that Greek was the vernacular language of the boy Paul, while, as

¹ This Article is from the second Number of the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1854.

the son of an orthodox Jewish family, he was duly instructed at school in the Hebrew and Syro-Chaldaic tongues; and, if we may assume this to be true, he would in all probability have read Greek works in early life. Be this, however, as it may, we have next to view him as the zealous pupil of the Rabbi Gamaliel at Jerusalem, who was miraculously converted on a journey to Damascus, and received a Divine call to labor as a messenger of the Gospel among the Gentiles, and especially among the Greeks. If, then, in obedience to the heavenly mandate, he conceived the great design of liberating Christianity from the bonds of Jewish sectarianism, he thereby, at the same time, imposed upon himself the task of effecting a transition in his own mind from oriental to Greek modes of thought and feeling. Would he not, therefore, be compelled to seek some degree of acquaintance with the latter? And, as he devoted years to the labor of preparing himself for his difficult missionary enterprise (three years in Damascus and Arabia, Gal. 1: 18; fourteen years in Cilicia, Gal. 2: 1; one year in Antioch, Acts 11: 26; and, later still, a considerable period in Cesarea, Acts 24: 27), is it at all credible that, during this lengthened season of preparation, he devoted no attention to the habitudes of thought and expression peculiar to those, to whom he wished to preach? To him, as a public speaker, a knowledge of the every-day language of the Greeks must, indeed, have been of preëminent importance; nor could he have neglected entirely the Greek literature, inasmuch as this people placed so high a value upon its writers, and was, it may be said, intellectually governed by them. At any rate, some familiarity with their works would open up to the Apostle, throughout the whole cultivated world of that time, Rome herself not excepted, a readier access to the hearts and feelings of mankind. Even if it be supposed that the more strictly learned writings of the Greeks did not fall in his way, we cannot imagine this to have been the case with their popular writers, whose subject-matter and diction offered him numerous opportunities of establishing a connection between their statements or phraseology, and his glad mission of salvation in Christ.

In this way, the peculiarities of the language employed by Paul in his Epistles, find a satisfactory explanation. For, while its *material* groundwork was Judaic, its *form* was borrowed from the Greek. As a zealous Jew and a disciple of the Pharisees, Paul adhered most closely to the mode of expression, which

characterized the sacred writings of his nation; and that he was also able to deliver a public oration in the Syro-Chaldaic, or mother-tongue of the Palestine of his day, is expressly stated in Acts 21: 40. Hence, for example, he begins and ends all his Epistles with the Hebraic formula of salutation, and avoids the Greek *χαίρειν*; hence his diction (particularly in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians), whenever he reasons from the Old Testament, or avails himself of the forms of Rabbinical disputation, assumes a marked Hebraic coloring; hence, lastly, he occasionally quotes the Old Testament in conformity with the original Hebrew text, and not the Greek translation. As a general rule, however, he employs the latter as his fountain-head; and that, generally speaking, the Greek was more familiar to him than the Hebrew, is shown in all those passages of his Epistles, where he is less dependent upon the Old Testament, or where he enters upon the mention of present circumstances (as in his closing exhortations), or in which he speaks with more than ordinary fervor. The Greek he uses is for this reason the common popular language of the Hellenists of his day, the so-called *κοινή*, in the form of the Macedonian-Alexandrine dialect, which is based upon the Septuagint. But, with how much greater purity, delicacy and freedom, than we meet with in that Translation, does he know how to handle the Greek idiom! This is most clearly shown in his Epistles to the Corinthians. Now it is certainly true, that he acquired this dexterity in the employment of the language principally from intercourse with learned and distinguished Greeks; but that he derived it also from some acquaintance with the Hellenic literature is betrayed, as we shall see, by evidence the most unequivocal. And what branches of this literature may those have been, which thus attracted his attention? As an inspired orator in the service of Christ, he would scarcely have concerned himself either with the mythological and philosophical, or in any way with the purely scientific, writings of the Greeks. The philosophy of the Hellenes (e. g. the Stoics and Epicureans, Acts 17: 18), was probably not entirely unfamiliar to the great Apostle, but could have had no preponderating importance in his estimation, inasmuch as he designed to bring unto the wisdom-seeking Greeks nothing except the "foolishness" of "preaching Christ crucified" (1 Cor. 1: 22). He does not, however, reject philosophy in the abstract, but only its perversion, in his deprecatory exhortation that no one should

allow himself to be led away from Christ through it (Col. 2: 8). On the other hand, for the end he had in view, the assistance derivable from the historians, national poets, and, above all, the popular orators, must have been regarded as exceedingly important; the historians, in making him better acquainted with the character of the Greeks; the poets, in enabling him to render his preaching attractive, by connecting it with favorite expressions from their songs; and the popular orators, by instructing him by what means this remarkably acute and gifted people could most surely be convinced and influenced. The interpreters have often shown that his language, in numerous passages, presents striking resemblances to that of Thucydides, Xenophon and Plato.¹ From the popular poets he has borrowed passages on three occasions: Acts 17: 28, from the *Phaenomena* of Aratus: τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἰομέν; 1 Cor. 15: 33, from the comic poet, Menander: φθάρουσιν ἡθὴ χρηστὸν ὁμιλίαι κακῇ, and Titus 1: 12, from Epimenides of Crete (whom, on account of the truth of his dictum, he calls a "prophet"): Κρήτες αἰεὶ ψεύσονται, κατὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί. But in respect to the popular orators, it may be assumed that Paul had read several of them, and, assuredly before all others, the noblest and most celebrated of their number, Demosthenes of Athens. For in his speeches he found that *δυνάμεις*, power of illustration, acuteness of reasoning in weighing arguments *pro* and *contra*, and powerful mastery over human feeling, in which he surpassed all others of his countrymen; to him he must have felt attracted as to a kindred spirit by his moral earnestness, strict sense of truth, and lively veneration for the Deity.² It is well known that Aeschines, the inveterate opponent of Demosthenes, trusted more to dazzling displays of rhetorical art; and Paul, on account of the rivalry between these two great masters of eloquence, had perhaps perused his speeches. The frequent use of rhetorical interrogation, of asseveration, and of objections introduced in the form of dialogue, Paul has in common with Demosthenes. We call

¹ Cf. Wetstein's *Commentar zum neuen Testament*. C. L. Bauer, *philologia Thucydideo-Paulina*. Hal. 1773. G. Raphellii, *annotationes in N. T. e Xenophonte, Polybio, etc.* Lugd. Batav. 1747.

² A firm belief in the gracious providence, as also in the inexorable justice of the gods, breathes through all the orations of Demosthenes (cf. *Epist.* 4, p. 1487, Reiske). The admirable tract of Theremin, entitled "Die Beredsamkeit eine Tugend," speaks more fully upon this subject.

to recollection only such questions as *τί οὖν ἔστι* (cf. *Leptin.* p. 530) in 1 Cor. 5: 12: *τί γάρ μοι, κ. τ. λ.* (*adv. Conon.* p. 729: *τί ταῦτα ἐμοί*; quid hæc ad me pertinent?), and *τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν*; in Rom. 4: 1. 6: 1 (cf. *pro Coronâ*, p. 287: *τί οὖν φημί δεῖν*). Both resemble each other, moreover, in subtle delicacy of expression, as e. g. when Paul avoids self-praise, or softens the severity of the censures he pronounces upon his readers, and in their irony amounting almost to sarcasm, as e. g. when he extols the strength of the Corinthians by contrasting it with his own weakness (1 Cor. 4: 10), or when he asks the Corinthians, whether the word of God went forth from them, or came unto them alone (1 Cor. 14: 36). Both pay great attention to the arrangement of their proofs or illustrations, and prefer to place those on which they lay least stress in the middle of the argument. In this, Demosthenes followed the Homeric dictum: *κακούς δ' εἰς μέσον ἔλασεν*; and so, too, Paul, when he uses a passage of the Old Testament allegorically (e. g. 1 Cor. 14: 21, where the historical sense of the text quoted from the Psalms is not so much considered, as the aptness of the expressions employed for illustrating the matter in hand); for this was to him rather a popular elucidation than a formal example. Such similarities of language may probably be explained by a certain resemblance in the character of the two men; but when, in addition, numerous, and, in great degree, quite characteristic parallels with Demosthenean forms of expression, as well in particular words as in the construction of entire sentences, are met with in the Pauline Epistles, it must be thought extremely probable that the Apostle had read the Attic orator, and has interwoven involuntary reminiscences of such reading in his writings. Some of these parallelisms have been collected by Kypke, in his *Observationes sacre*, Wratislav. 1755, and more can be discovered by an attentive reader of Demosthenes. We will here bring forward a few of the most remarkable, and, in so doing, follow the order of succession of the Pauline Epistles.

Romans.

1: 29, *μεστούς φθόρου, φόρου, κ. τ. λ.* Cf. Dem. *adv. Androt*, p. 603: *ἀνθρώπους ὀνειδῶν καὶ κακῶν μεστούς*.¹ In both passages a

¹ We quote according to Reiske's pages. But Kypke, in the cases in which we refer to him, has employed an earlier edition.

union of secret and open vices is described; "a sentina of shameful lusts and deeds *fills out*, so to speak, their whole being."

2: 14, *ἔσθη φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιεῖ*. By *φύσει* a "natural impulse," or instinct, is denoted. So Dem. pro Coron., p. 26: "a fondness for hearing others defamed, rather than praised, *φύσει πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐπάσχει*."

2: 5. Here, as in 3: 5, *ὀργή* is evidently "punishment," after a frequent usage of Aeschines and Demosthenes. Cf. in Mid. p. 391: *τῷ δρᾶσαντι ὀργὴν ἔταξεν ὁ νόμος*.

5: 7. In this remarkable passage, Paul seeks to express the incomparable love of God in yielding up His Son to death, by a climax (*μόλις, τάχα*), and, indeed, from an Hellenic point of view. For this reason, *δικαίου* and *ἀγαθοῦ* cannot be masculines; for the notions of the "just" and "good" man run into each other (Cic. de Offic. 2, 11: *ex justitia viri boni appellantur*; cf. Rom. 7: 12). Both are rather neuters, and *δίκαιον* is "a right" (Dem. in Mid. p. 515: *ἐλπίζω τὸ δίκαιον εἶξιν*), but *ἀγαθόν* has the article to designate "what is evidently, notoriously good." It may be that the case of Chabrias presented itself here before the mind of the Apostle, of whom Demosthenes, Leptin. p. 481, explicitly affirms: "Chabrias died as commander in a battle, *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, φιλόπολις ὢν*." In our text, then, *ὑπὲρ* before *δικαίου* denotes the motive (as in 2 Thess. 1: 4, 5). "For hardly will any one die for others *on behalf of their (mere) right*; rather, perhaps, *on account of the evident good, which they possess*." For "Right" is the object of *cool reflection* or consideration; only "goodness" can inspire a *higher enthusiasm* (e. g. Leonidas died at Thermopylae for the salvation and honor of his native land). But Christ died for godless and wicked men, of whom, to say nothing of a right, one can in no way predicate the possession of what is truly good.

6: 7, *ὁ ἀποθανὼν δεικνύεται ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας*. A proposition borrowed from civil legislation, to wit, that by death every transgression is atoned. So Dem. Epist. 3, p. 1478: *πάντων ἀμαρτημάτων ὄρος τελευτή*.

7: 18, *τὸ θέλει παράκενται μοι, τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οὐκ εὐρίσκω*. The opposition here generally set forth is referred to a special case in Dem. Epist. 5, p. 1490: *τὸ εὖ βούλεσθαι πάρεστιν, οὐ τοῦργον*.

14: 7, *κνρίῳ ζῶμεν*. What is here principally meant, is, not our dependance upon the Lord, but a complete *self-devotion* to Him.

A passage in Dem. ad epist. Philippi, p. 66 (Kypke), serves to elucidate this expression, where it is said of the Athenian ambassadors who had been bribed by King Philip: οὐκ αἰσχύνονται Φιλίππῳ ζῶντες.

14: 15, ὁ ἀδελφὸς λυπείται. Not "he is troubled," but "he suffers injury." Hence ἀπολύειν, referring to his ruin, follows. Dem. pro Cor., p. 246: "if Philip had departed τῶν Ἑλλήνων μηδένα λυπήσας."

First Corinthians.

4: 13, καθάρματα, "refuse," "offscourings," as a designation of despised men. How strong the expression is, may be seen from the additional epithets in Dem. in Mid., p. 578: "all other men are looked upon by him as καθάρματα καὶ πτωτοὶ καὶ οὐδὲ ἄνθρωποι."

4: 4, οὐδὲν ἑμαντῷ σύνοικα. Literally so Aeschines: μηδὲν ἀντὶ συνειδώς, and similarly Dem. Epist. 2, p. 112: εὐνοικα ἑμαντῷ σύνοικα.

6: 4, καθίζετε, according to the context: "set ye them as judges?" Cf. Dem. in Mid., p. 415: the judges, ὁπόσους ἂν ἡ πόλις καθίζη.

6: 18, ὁ πορνέων εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα ἀμαρτάνει. Cf. Aeschin. in Timarch., p. 176 (Kypke): ὅσα εἰς τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἡμάρτηκεν. Here the orator is speaking of the so-called "cinædus," who, however, is not excluded by the language of the Apostle.

12: 23. To the less honored parts of our body τιμὴν περισσοτέραν περιτίθεμεν. Better *clothing* is meant. But Demosthenes, Orat. amator., p. 1417, uses these words figuratively: "know, that good speeches τοῖς εἰποῦσι δόξαν περιτιθένται."

14: 16, 23, 24. Ἰδιώτης in Demosthenes (e. g. adv. Mid., p. 325) is frequently a man who has no public office; Paul uses it to denote *the hearer*, in opposition to the teacher who appears in public.

16: 15, εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἑταξαν ἑαυτούς, "they devoted themselves voluntarily to the service of the saints." Dem. de falsa legat., p. 201: εἰς τίνα τάξιν ἑταξεν ἑαυτὸν ὁ Αἰσχίνης ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ.

Second Corinthians.

4: 17, τὸ παραντίκα ἑλαφρόν τῆς θλίψεως is not: "the transitively (Luther: zeitlich, temporarily) light affliction," but "the

present light." For the *future* forms the antithesis. Cf. Dem. Philipp. 2, p. 28: ἡ παραντίκα ἡδονὴ μείζον ἰσχύει τοῦ ὕστερον συνόσσειν μέλλοντος. [This use of παραντίκα is frequent in Thucydides; e. g. 2, 64: ἡ παραντίκα λαμπρότης, καὶ ἐς τὸ ἔπειτα δόξα. 8, 82: τὴν τε παραντίκα ἐλπίδα. — Translator.]

5: 20, ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ πρεσβεύομεν, we are ambassadors, not *in Christ's stead*, but for Christ's sake, *for his cause*. For what follows: "as if God exhorted by us," is uttered by the Apostle as an ambassador *in God's stead*. The same usage occurs in Demosth. de f. legat., p. 244: ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καλῶς ἐπρέσβενσαν, "for your interests they have well performed the embassy."

8: 5, ἑαυτοὺς ἔδωκαν πρῶτον τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν. A fine expression of self-devotion or complete self-sacrifice to the beloved. We find a striking parallel in Dem. pro Cor., p. 344 (Kypke): "many celebrated orators as there have been in Athens, yet οὐδαίς τούτων πώποτε διαπαντός ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν τῇ πόλει. Very significant, also, is the πρῶτον of the Apostle: "what was destined for the suffering Christians, that they gave first (i. e. above all, principally) from love to God and to me."

9: 12, ἡ διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας, "the service of collecting the alms." Λειτουργία occurs frequently in Demosth. (e. g. in Lep- tin., p. 463, 12) of a public *contribution*, furnishing the means required for some branch of the public service; but διακονία is the *Jewish* designation of the same thing (cf. 8: 4. 9: 1, 13), for in the synagogues the collection of the alms was the business (עֲבוּדָה) of the *servants* or *deacons* (Vitranga de synagoga, p. 933).

13: 8. "For we have no power *against* the truth (κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας), but *for* the truth (ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας)," i. e. on behalf of, in furtherance of the truth. The two prepositions are opposed to each other in the same sense by Demosth. in Epist. 2, p. 1469: οὐ καθ' ὑμῶν δεινὸς ὢν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.

Galatians.

1: 6, 10. The peculiar use of μετατίθεσθαι, to shift one's place (as e. g. the wind), for "to *change one's resolution*," and likewise of πείσαι, to persuade, for "to *seek a person's approbation*," is found also in Dem. pro Cor., p. 338.

2: 6, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι (ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν, οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει). The preposition ἀπὸ, interrupted by the parenthesis, is an instance of anacoluthon, very suitable to the excited feel-

ing of the Apostle, and for this reason a special explanatory clause follows: *ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο. Οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναι τι* (those who pass for something great) is genuine Greek (Xen. Hier. 2, 1: *τῶν δοκούντων ἀνδρῶν εἶναι*, who are looked upon as true men). But the words of the parenthesis, spoken in a depreciatory spirit ("what they really did, was matter of indifference to me"), have their analogy in Dem. de contribut., p. 175: "if any one of you know the families of Aristides and Miltiades, *ὁμοῖά ποτ' ἐστί*, how insignificant their present qualifications are;" and contra Theocrit., p. 512, in Olympiodor, p. 696 (Kypke): *οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει*, it makes no difference to me, is all one and the same to me.

3: 22, 23, *συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφή τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίας, and ἐπὶ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκεκλεισμένοι*. The latter expression borders very closely on that of Dem. in Philipp. 1, p. 18: *ἐὰν πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν νόμῳ κατακλείσῃς*, "if you will bind the whole force by law." For *συνκλείειν*, "to enclose," "embrace," with *ἐπὶ* following it, is said of the ruler, who brings prisoners, under supervision of a jailor, into safe custody. Such a ruler is "the scripture," i. e. God, whose will it announces, and the jailor is in the first verse "sin," and in the second "the law." Now the last held all men *under obligation*, which being unable to fulfil (v. 19), they were thereby "all concluded under sin." But both took place for a salutary purpose, viz. *to keep men in safe custody* for that higher liberty, which they were afterwards to attain through faith (*ἐφρουρούμεθα* must be joined with *εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν*).

5: 1, *μὴ πάλιν ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθαι*. A *shameful bondage* is alluded to. For in the verses cited by Dem. pro Cor., p. 322, the sense is similar:

— *ὡς μὴ, ζυγὸν αὐχένι θέντες,
δουλοσύνης συγχεράν ἀμφὶ ἔχουσιν ὕβριν.*

The yoke *shuts in* (*ἐνέχει*) the neck, surrounding it on both sides (*ἀμφίς*).

6: 17, *κόπους μηδεὶς μοι παρεχέτω!* Dem. de republ. ordin., p. 69: *μὴ θορυβήσῃ μοι μηδεὶς!* [So also De Pace, p. 60: *καὶ μοι μὴ θορυβήσῃ μηδεὶς πρὶν ἀκοῦσαι*. The same *προδιόρθωσις*, or *participative* request is met with in 8, 32. 13, 3. 57, 59, ed. Bekker. — Translator.].

Ephesians.

4: 19. In the same way as ἀσέλγεια, "lasciviousness," is here joined with ἀκαθαρσία, so it is found with ἔβρις, in Dem. in Mid., p. 514.

5: 12, τὰ κρυφῇ γινόμενα ἐπ' αὐτῶν αἰσχρόν ἐστι καὶ λέγειν. The delicate aversion to make explicit mention of their shameful deeds, which is here expressed, is betrayed also by Demosthenes, e. g. in Conon., p. 729 (Kypke): ἃ πολλὰν αἰσχύνην ἔχει καὶ λέγειν, μὴ ὅτι γε (the same particles as in 1 Cor. 6: 13) ποιεῖν. Olynth. 2, p. 23: shameful deeds, οἷα ὁκνοῖ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὀνομάσαι.

6: 19, ἵνα μοι δοθῇ λόγος. Meyer and many commentators understand this as a supplication for Divine communication of the *meaning and purport of the utterance*. But such a communication Paul *always* needed, while he here emphasizes the fact of his being *an ambassador in bonds* (ἐν αἰλώσει). We shall, therefore, refer these words more correctly, with Wolf and others, to the *opportunity for speaking*, which in Col. 4: 3 is called *θύρα λόγου*. For Paul, when a prisoner at Cesarea, enjoyed a certain amount of liberty (Acts 24: 23), although the privilege of speaking in public was denied him; and for one, who is in bonds, it is difficult to speak with boldness. The sense, then, is as follows: "pray also for me, that an opportunity to speak be given unto me,—an opportunity, that is, of opening my mouth boldly (whensoever I wish to speak) to proclaim the mystery of the Gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds; (pray, I say) that I may declare myself as boldly in respect of the Gospel, as I ought to speak." The close of the oration against Leptines furnishes an elucidation of the Apostle's language: "I indeed shall marvel if (θαυμάζω, εἰ) you punish with death those who utter counterfeit coin, but are willing to give the word (δῶσετε λόγον) to those, who make the whole city false and not trustworthy." We ourselves employ the same phrase as a parliamentary expression. Demosthenes hopes that the assembly will *not* confer the right of speech upon Leptines and his associates, for in this way, as the commencement of the oration informs us, the proposal of the Leptinean law was rejected without further ceremony.

Colossians.

1: 18, *ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς πρωτεύων*. The *ἐν πᾶσι* must be neuter (as in English version), inasmuch as *τὰ πάντα* stands in the preceding and following context. So Dem. orat. amator., p. 1416: "consider it your interest, *τὸ πρωτεύειν ἐν ᾗπασιν*."

2: 23, *ἅτινά ἐστι λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας*. In this connection *λόγος* is "the show" or "seeming," strictly, "the mere word," in opposition to *ἔργον*, the reality. Cf. Dem. orat. 1. in Onetor., p. 570. An exact parallel is found in Dem. Leptin., p. 462: *ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο λόγον μὲν τινα ἔχον· εἰ δέ τις ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάσῃ, ψεῦδος ἂν φανείη*. Hereby is explained also James 2: 14: *ἴαν πίστιν λέγει τις ἔχειν, ἔργα δὲ μὴ ἔχει*, where a *seeming*, i. e. an unreal, *faith* is denoted by *λέγει*.

First Thessalonians.

4: 11, *ἡσυχάζειν καὶ πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια*. Here the words of Demosthenes, exord. oration., p. 143: *ἔχειν ἡσυχίαν καὶ τὰ ὑμέτερα αὐτῶν πράττειν*, seem to have presented themselves to the mind of the Apostle.

First Timothy.

1: 19, *δικαίῳ νόμῳ οὐ κεῖται*. Kypke explains the word *κεῖται* from the fact of the laws being frequently hewn among the ancients upon tables and columns. Cf. Habakkuk 2: 11. The objection to this explanation is that these pillars did not *lie*, but were set upright. The expression is rather the passive of *νόμον τιθέναι* (whence *νομοθέτης*; cf. Dem. Leptin., p. 498), and is, therefore, to be rendered: "for a righteous man the law is not given." Dem. adv. Timocrat., p. 465 (Kypke): *νόμοι κεῖνται τοῖς ἀρχουσιν*.

3: 3, *πάροις* might be "vino deditus" (as v. 8). But Chrysostom has already explained it by *ὑβριστής*, and as standing in opposition to *ἐπεικής*, and in truth the word is used of "petulantia" and "violentia," apart from the idea of vinous intoxication. So Dem. Epist. 4, p. 1483, has employed *παροινεῖν* in the sense of "to outrage."

5: 17, *διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσα*. Here *τιμή* is not so much "honor," as an "honorary testimony" and "reward." Dem. Leptin., p. 367: *δικαίως ἡξιώθη τάντης τῆς τιμῆς* (of this honorary reward).

6: 5, *διεφθαμένους τὸν νοῦν* are "irrational, senseless men." Dem. in Olympiodor., p. 697: *διέφθαρται καὶ παραφρορεῖ*.

Titus.

1: 11, *οἵκους ἀνατρέποντες*. Dem. in Aristogeiton, p. 496 (Kypke) has the same expression: *ἀνατρέψαι τὴν πόλιν*, "to subvert, destroy the state."

We may further mention Hebrews 13: 17, where "*ἀνυποκρίτως*," "unprofitable," is used as a less forcible expression for "*ὀφθαλμωδῶς*," "very prejudicial," exactly as in Dem. Epist., p. 1482.

What shall we say concerning these numerous parallelisms between the language of Demosthenes and Paul? That the latter imitated the former, and adorned his writings with phrases and flourishes borrowed from the great orator? Far otherwise. But that Paul derived them all by mere accident from the conversational language of his day, is perhaps just as incredible. On the contrary, the assertion seems no longer too bold, that he had read, and was familiar with, Demosthenes, the model of Greek popular eloquence, and involuntarily appropriated many of his expressions. That he should have named him, or any other author, whose writings he had read, no one will be so unreasonable as to expect, inasmuch as no obligation or inducement could have existed for so doing. But does not our assumption militate against the derogatory opinion which the Apostle entertained respecting eloquence in general? We will see. He affirms, it is true, in 1 Cor. 1: 17, that he does not preach *ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγον*, and 2: 1 ff., that he had not come with excellency of speech or wisdom, nor with approbation-seeking (*παιδεῖς*, compare above on Gal. 1: 10) words of wisdom, but with the simple preaching of Jesus Christ, the crucified, and with demonstration of the Spirit and of power; lastly, he asserts, 2 Cor. 11: 6, that he was indeed unlearned, not professionally versed in speech (*λόγῳ*), yet not so in deeper insight, in real knowledge (*γνώσει*). He expresses himself, as we perceive, in modest or depreciatory terms concerning the rhetorical form and finish of his language, because many of his readers (1 Cor. 3, 1) preferred, on account of the outward character and expression, the teaching of Apollos, who was a learned Hellenist of Alexandria (Acts 18: 24 ff.), yet in respect of *doctrine*, which was the same thing, he boasts of his

real knowledge. What, then, he disclaims, are laboriously excogitated flowers of oratory, or the sophistical artifices of the degenerate rhetoricians of his era, but in no way the pungent expression, strict demonstrative reasoning, and mighty mastery over human feeling, for which Demosthenes was so distinguished. That Paul, too, was esteemed by his contemporaries as a great orator, is shown by the judgment of those inhabitants of Lystra, who worshipped him as the god Hermes, "because he was the chief speaker" (Acts 14: 12). But the power of his oratory laid almost exclusively in the original and overpowering fervency with which he proclaimed the truths of salvation that had been revealed to him by God. How strong his own conviction was upon this point, is testified by the sublime passage, 2 Cor. 10: 4, in which he declares that "although he walks in the flesh, he fights not with carnal weapons, but with divine, casting down every strong hold and lofty edifice (i. e. all sophistical knowledge which exalteth itself against the knowledge of God), bringing under captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

Hence, then, it will be evident that the influence, which his acquaintance with Demosthenes exerted upon his language, in no way destroyed his own individuality, nor his rabbinical erudition, nor the impulse of his fiery spirit, which hurries him forward with such facility into parentheses, anacolutha, and negligent arrangement of words (Winer, *Gramm.*, p. 433), that are far from Demosthenean. How very different is his language, generally speaking, from the smooth and polished style of Philo and Josephus! These writers emulated the Greeks in all things, and sought to pass for Greeks; Paul, on the contrary, attempts nothing more than to convince both Jews and Greeks that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth (Rom. 1: 16).

So, too, no doubt is thrown upon the *inspiration* of Paul's Epistles by the Hellenic form of expression, which to a great extent prevails therein. For it may, at the present day, be probably regarded as established, that the inspiration of the sacred writers does not exclude their individual characteristics, nor a certain amount of diligent, artistic and stilistic preparation. In favor of this opinion we may cite, for example, the metrical construction of the poetical books of the Old Testament, and in the New the artistic arrangement of the Gospel of Matthew.¹

¹ Compare my Essay upon this subject in Felt's *theologisch. Mitarbeiten*, Bd. I.

So, too, Luke, the disciple of Paul, commences his λόγος α' (the Gospel) with a strictly classic period: ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν, κ. τ. λ., and in like manner his λόγος β' (the Acts) with: τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποίησάμην. Indeed, the latter draws the picture of the diffusion of Christianity from the smallest beginnings to its dominion over the whole of the then civilized world (from Jerusalem to Rome) upon so systematic a plan, and with so classic a finish, that it may truly be compared with Thucydides.

Let me now be permitted to add one closing remark. If the great Apostle was not ashamed, in furtherance of the end he had in view, to learn something from the Attic orator, can it be unbecoming for our clergy to refresh and fertilize their minds by the study of the ancient classic writers? What Luther thought upon this subject is known to all. Yet in our day it would almost seem that many preachers considered the symbolic teaching of the church to be alone worthy of their diligence; and, as a general thing, knowledge, strictly so called, is now placed by theologians far too much in the background. It would be lamentable if this tendency should continue to predominate; for a thorough historico-critical searching of the Scriptures (John 5: 39) is the life-breath of Protestantism.

ARTICLE VI.

THE GENIUS OF HEBREW AND OF ROMAN LEARNING.¹

By P. B. Spear, Professor of the Hebrew and Latin Languages,
Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.

THE claims of sacred and classical learning as an essential part of a sound and liberal education, have been so able advocated by scholars and divines, and so fully acknowledged in our college halls and churches, both in this country and in Europe, that little additional argument is necessary. Viewed mentally

¹ A Discourse delivered at the last Commencement at Madison University.

or morally, practically or theoretically, whether for the preacher, teacher or advocate, for the judge, statesman or diplomatist, it is granted by men best qualified to judge, that that education is not complete, however extensive, in which Hebrew, Greek and Latin studies have not constituted to some extent an elemental part. Regarding these claims, then, as well established, we shall aim, not so much by close argumentation, as by the simpler process of comparison, to develop something of the genius of Hebrew and of Roman learning, whether this learning be considered subjectively, as to the respective nation that furnishes it, or objectively, as to the scholar who acquires it. Our subject, as we view it, resolves itself into two parts: Hebrew and Roman learning treated, first, comparatively with the Greek; secondly, comparatively with each other. We design so to treat these divisions that the genius of the two departments of learning, which we represent, shall appear by the successive impressions made upon the mind of the hearer, rather than by distinct and formal inferences drawn by the speaker.

I. Hebrew and Roman Learning treated comparatively with the Greek.

The Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, as the grand *trio* among the languages of antiquity, as the *sacred three* in the inscription on the cross, have so long been associated in the minds of men of letters, and so intimately inwrought into the soundest scholarship, that we may be allowed to some extent to view them together. In doing this, we observe, in the first place, that the Greek is *intermediate*, both as to the period to which it belongs and as to its general character, and, therefore, may properly be used by comparison to fix more definitely the relative position and character of the Hebrew and Latin. Secondly, that the Hebrew, in one aspect, is above all comparison. It is the language of Divine inspiration. It is the vehicle of God's word to man. Do not, therefore, understand that we bring this language down to a level with Latin and Greek, or with any merely human language.

The names of Jerusalem, Athens and Rome have, to the Christian and scholar, a sort of talismanic power to call up the mantled shades of generations of men, reaching, in a long line, far back into a gray antiquity. As centres of action for three

mighty national minds, these cities cluster around them most of those literary and archaeological attractions, which have engaged the learned, since light broke in upon the darkness of the Middle Ages. When they, with the countries around them, the men and manners that graced them, and the genius that exalted them, became the object of earnest inquiry, the mind awoke from the slumbers of a long night, and began to expand itself into the thousand forms of enterprise that have carried man upward along the highway of modern civilization. Human society was slumbering, as if unconscious of its glorious destiny, until the spirit of the past coming up from men of renown, breathed into it new social, intellectual and moral life, and, by a new resurrection, brought upon the stage of action men who had the spirit and power of the heroes of the old world.

Phœnicia with the Holy Land, Egypt and Babylonia with their letters, their wisdom, or magical skill, embodying, in their learning, not only the infancy of society, but much also of its manliness and strength, had contributed not a little to form the Grecian mind. Greece, in plastic art, in a nice literary taste, and in the true philosophic spirit, far outstripping all the nations that preceded her, had contributed still more largely to form the Roman mind. The Roman mind, by nature practical, strong, unyielding, steady in its action, in ability to rule never surpassed, has moulded the world, has infused itself largely into all the nations of Europe, stamping them much with its own impress and form. Still, we should observe, that, since the revival of learning (A. D. 1266), the minds of mark among the Italians, Spaniards, French, Germans and English, were not moulded exclusively by the infusion of the Roman, or of the Greek, or Hebrew element, but all these, combining with native genius, have given to scholars of modern times their characteristic greatness. Among the Italians, DANTE (1266—1321), the author of the "*Divina Comedia*," the first to quote familiarly from the writings of Livy, Virgil and Cicero; then PETRARCH (1304—1374), "the great restorer of classical literature," the man who led the way in drawing the classics from the dungeons in which they were immured; then BOCCACCIO (1313—1375), who transcribed with his own hand most of the Latin poets, orators and historians; then POGGIO (1380—1459), who spent fifty years, with untiring perseverance and wonderful sagacity, in searching out and collecting manuscripts from monasteries, convents, or

rotting in the bottom of dungeons; then the MEDICI: COSMO first, who spent his immense wealth in patronizing learned men, and in gathering manuscripts of Latin classics, securing in particular complete copies of Virgil, Cicero, Seneca, Ovid and Tibullus; and after him, more especially, LORENZO (1448—1492), who sent messengers into every part of the globe for the purpose of collecting books, and spared no pains or expense to promote classical learning; then MACHIAVELLI (1469—1527), the first to become distinguished among the Italians for a pure classical style; then TASSO (1544—1595), who was a prodigy of learning at ten, and at twenty-two planned his great work of "Jerusalem delivered;" all these and many more who were associated with them, seizing on the Greek, the Latin, and the oriental tongues, becoming imbued with their spirit, and infusing this spirit into the wide social and political circles in which they moved, waked up Italy to a new life, and created for it an era that in learning, in arts and commerce, almost rivalled the age of the Caesars. Princes began to vie with each other, not in wealth or dominion, but in literary taste and elegance; and their mansions were the abodes of the learned.

Spaniards and Portuguese also feel the effect of this awakening, and drawing, first from Italian and Grecian sources, then from oriental as introduced by the Saracens from the south, develop their own intellectual character: in the twelfth century, through the author of "THE CÍD" (the Hero), or the great national epic, that celebrates the victory of the Christian over the Mussulman; in the thirteenth century, through ALPHONSO X., "the Learned," who reformed the laws, made astronomical tables, wrote chronicles, published miscellanies, and instituted chairs of law and philosophy at Salamanca; in the fifteenth century, through VILLENA and SANTILLANA, both men of high rank, who pour forth their eloquence against the inquisition, and write histories, commentaries, translations and poems of no small merit; in the sixteenth century, through Christopher Columbus, whose letters and Journals, as coming from the most learned and celebrated navigator of the age, awakened a profound interest, and through CASTILLO, who collected one hundred and thirty lyric poets; in the seventeenth century, through CERVANTES, the author of "Don Quixote," or the "Adventures of the Hero of La Mancha," and through LOSSA DE VEGA, the "Prodigy of Nature," "the Phoenix of Spain," who, besides other writings, wrote more

than two thousand dramas ; through these, and a long list besides that might be added, the south-western peninsula assumes a new literary life.

In the mean time, the German, French and English, drinking from Hebrew and classic fountains, send forth, in every department of learning, hosts of distinguished men, too many to be even mentioned, as poets, historians and philosophers, antiquarians, philologists and divines, mathematicians, statesmen and orators, whose influence will be felt, and whose fame will grow, till the latest ages.

A glance at history is sufficient to show, that the revival of learning throughout Europe went hand in hand with a close study of Hebrew and classical learning ; nor is it difficult to show that the high position of German, English and American scholars at the present day, is owing to their taking advantage of this lofty *stepping-stone* ; that, had they despised this and confined themselves to native resources, there is nothing in their genius to exalt them above their predecessors. Nay, in all that belongs to a lofty excellence, to a true civilization, they probably would never have reached the eminence occupied by the Hebrew law-giver, historians and bards, or by the German and Roman philosophers, orators and poets. It is too late to affect to despise the wisdom of the past, or the media — the language and literature — through which it is drawn, or the strength, grace and enlarged discipline which the thorough study of the ancient languages is fitted to impart.

Eight periods mark somewhat distinctly the intellectual development and progress of man. The first, second and third are respectively the *Hebrew*, the *Greek*, and the *Latin* periods. The fourth began about the middle of the first century (A. D.), when the New Testament authors and the *Apostolical Fathers*, as Barnabas, Clemens of Rome, Ignatius and Polycarp, lived, labored and wrote, and, by their inspired words and holy thoughts, began to sway the literature of the Roman world. The fifth, very closely allied to this, is the period of the *Christian Fathers*, as Jerome, Augustine and Chrysostom, who flourished near the close of the fourth century, and others both earlier and later, who, by their sublime sentiments and pious effusions, though mingled at times with unreasonable austerities and stoical absurdities, have secured a high seat in the empire of mind. The sixth was the golden period of *Saracen learning*, memorable for

the brilliant Haroun al Raschid and the Caliphs of Bagdad, who patronized the arts and sciences, softened the character of the untamable Arab, and, throughout the East, spread the light of literature and science, while Europe was passing through a long night of darkness. The seventh was the period of the *Scholastic Divines*, who flourished in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, of whom were THOMAS AQUINAS of Naples, called the "Angel of the Schools," the "Eagle of Divines," and DUNS SCOTUS, the "Subtle Doctor," and the Head of the Schools of the University at Paris, and others through whom light began to shine upon the middle ages of Europe. Finally, we have the period of the *Reformers*, commencing with LUTHER (1517), and resulting in all the grandeur and glory of that civilization which, under the auspices of the church and the schools, is pouring its flood of light over all the nations of the earth.

A moderate knowledge of history shows us that the last five of the eight periods named, were kindled, fed and nourished by the fires of genius and learning that burned so purely and brightly among the Hebrews, Greeks and Romans. The Hebrew and Greek more pervaded and impregnated the period of the New Testament writers and that of the Fathers. The Hebrew, with its cognates the Arabic and Chaldee, more infused itself into the Saracen period; and Hebrew, Greek and Latin almost equally into the period of the Scholastic Divines and that of the Reformers. The first three periods, then, as compared with the others, furnish the "pure fountains." Draw away, if it were possible, from the literature of modern nations, all the elements which directly or indirectly have flowed in from these pure fountains, and it would not be difficult to see that much of its glory had departed, that it was robbed of what constitutes its chief attractions.

The Hebrew mind, dawning upon the world in the age of Moses (about B. C. 1500), reached its height in the time of Solomon (about B. C. 1000). The Greek, rising like the sun about the time the Hebrew culminated, was in its zenith with Plato, Aristotle and Demosthenes (about B. C. 350). Near this time the Roman mind, beginning to manifest a remarkable fondness for some of the simpler forms of national literature, — for ballads and songs, for Oscan plays and Attelane fables, written in coarse Saturnian verse and acted in the open field, advanced thence rapidly in culture, and, through comic, tragic and epic

poets, through annalists, historians and orators, reached its golden age, its Augustan splendor, about the time of Christ. Thus, during 1500 years previously to the birth of our Saviour, the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Roman mind, had successively swayed, to a great extent, the literary tendencies and destinies of the world. That mind still lives, and, through its language, literature, religion and laws, is speaking to the heart and intellect of man, telling him what he has been in some of the noblest specimens of his being, and nerving him to higher and higher achievements in the strife of human destiny. Extinguish this mind, and you blot from the page of instruction the most important period in the history of human civilization. You shroud in darkness the origin and infancy of our race, as well as those important steps by which it is rising towards the perfection of that nature which allies it to angels and to God.

The Hebrew, Greek and Latin have long and deservedly had a high place in the curriculum of college studies. Nor could any one of these be excluded without essentially impairing the education which these studies aim to impart. Still, some distinction has obtained. The Hebrew, belonging to the domains of sacred learning, is consequently regarded more as a professional study. This is owing rather to the fact that the treasures preserved in this language are of a religious character, than to the want of adaptedness in the language itself and its literature, to the great ends of a general education. Confessedly no language is more marked, for the beautiful simplicity and philosophical regularity of its structure, or for the high perfection with which it is wrought, or for the lofty genius of the writers who used it, or for the originality and sublimity of the productions contained in it.

The Hebrew is a *finished* language. It gives evidence that it was handled by men of master minds, of great erudition, of correct judgment and taste, of sound criticism, who from time to time gave it such a structure and form, as best to adapt it to the genius and wants of the people who used it, and to make it for them the very best vehicle of thought. It must a long time have been a *written* as well as a spoken language, and thus, by the constant care and close attention of its writers, it must have been subjected to long and thorough culture.

The Hebrew has comparatively few anomalies or departures from the general laws of the language. It has a large number of onomatopœia, or words whose sound is significant of their

meaning, and which, therefore, invest the language with a wonderful activity and life. It has mostly trilateral roots, or roots of three essential radical letters, and each letter oftentimes invested with a remarkable significancy, thus endowing the word with a singular power of expression. It has mostly prefixes and suffixes, or preformatives and sufformatives, instead of particles, pronouns, auxiliaries, and other small words, thus imparting dignity, stateliness and strength to the combination of words in a sentence. It has two genders only, one for the strong and one for the weak, regarding all matter, things animate and inanimate, the powers of nature and the faculties of the mind, as dominant or subservient, as efficient and causing, or as recipient and cherishing, thus imbuing every proposition more or less with a creative energy and causing it silently to proclaim the great law of causation. It has strictly but two divisions of time, a past and a future; the present being regarded as an indefinitely small dividing point, and all events as really having already past, or as yet to come; thus giving a basis for the tenses and moods of the verb, as beautiful and philosophical as it is true and simple. It has great regularity in the formation of words from the stem-letters, consequently great regularity in the structure and inflection of verbs. It is prolific in synonyms, especially of those that express the virtues and qualities of the mind, thus furnishing, often, exceedingly nice shades and complexions of thought.

Rarely can a language furnish more striking characteristics than the above, and whoever examines them will find that they show, though not necessarily, a rich and polished language, yet, for the most part, one of great beauty and perfection, and a suitable vehicle of thought for Divine inspiration.

Again, perhaps no language retains more marks of the *primitive language* of man. It furnishes roots that run largely through languages of a subsequent formation; an alphabet that is a key to the origin, form and meaning of most other alphabets. It is indispensable to the scholar who would prosecute the work of comparative philology, or engage in the thorough study of general grammar. As the Latin unlocks the door to most of the occidental languages, making the attainment, especially of the Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, French, and, we may add, the German, a work of comparatively small labor, so the Hebrew unlocks the door, opens the way to the ready acquisition of the Oriental, to

the entire family of the Shemitish stock; to the Syriac, on the north, the language of Palmyra and Queen Zenobia, of Edessa and some of the Scripture Versionists; to the Arabic, on the south, the language of Mecca and Mohammed, of Bagdad and the Caliphs; to the Chaldee, in the east, the language of Babylonia and the Magi, and of parts of the Books of Daniel and Ezra; to the Ethiopic and Coptic, the Samaritan and Punic, all of which are vastly important to the historian, antiquarian, philologist and teacher, as well as to the theologian and divine.

The Hebrew holds to the Shemitish stock and to the Sanskrit itself, the learned language of India and for more than 2000 years a dead language, nearly as close and important a relation, as the Sanskrit holds to the whole class of Indo-Germanic languages, namely, to the Persian, in the east, and to the Greek, Latin, Germanic, Gothic, Sclavonic and Lithuanic, in the west.

That the Hebrew is regarded as the sacred language, that it is the vehicle of Divine revelation, and has found a place in theological learning, so far from invalidating its claims to the attention of the general scholar, and to a place in a college course, serve only to enhance these claims. For they are absolute, independent of all considerations of a professional nature, growing out, as they do, from the high position which this language, with its heaven-born literature, holds in the realm of letters, and from the high estimation in which it has been held by the first scholars in England and on the Continent, ever since the revival of learning, and in which it is now held by the best scholars in America.

Before we leave this first division of our subject, we ought to compare, somewhat more minutely, the distinctive features of Hebrew, Greek and Roman learning, in relation to national character, language and literature.

1. As man has characteristics as an individual, so he bears certain national marks, traits or lineaments that distinguish his nation from all other nations. In no other people is *nationality* loftier or more strikingly marked, than in the Hebrews, the Greeks, and the Romans. It imbues all their works. To study the impress of it, to get its exact type into the mind, to have the living conception of it inwrought into the soul, is one great end of philological study. It is the end above all others, that ennobles the mind, gives it comprehension and scope, and fits it for great and praise-worthy achievements. It is the grasping of this

as it existed in nations extinct, the incorporating of it into new States as they arise, that gives to them a *progressive* destiny. Thus the star of empire as its way is westward, shines with brighter and brighter effulgence as it successively culminates over the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Hebrews and Phoenicians, the Greeks, the Romans, and the English.

In the Roman we have prominently *life in the State*. He loses sight of himself in his devotion to the national weal. The idea of a civil community, a body politic, a commonwealth in which he is merged, with which he is identified, of which he constitutes a vital and essential part, sways all his views and feelings. The State, with its religion and gods, with its altars and fires; the State, with its august council of chosen men; the State, with its old type of manners; the State, with the sovereignty of its laws, with the supremacy of its rule; the State at home, the State abroad, he can never exclude from his mind. To strengthen it, to perpetuate it, to adorn it, in every way to magnify it, he conceives that not only himself, but the world with all its contributions, was made. His valor in the field, his wisdom in council, his indomitable will, his fame, he exults in only as they exalt the State. He has no idea of sharing them apart from the State. His pride is a pride of nation. He thinks of glory only as he can render his State illustrious, and that in turn can shed a lustre on his own name. His life, in the truest sense, he holds as belonging to his country, nor is he at liberty to save it, if thereby he stain, in the least, the Roman name. Hence the true Roman is by no means an abstract being, without necessary relations, a sort of quality that may fit anything to which it can be applied, but a concrete with a living existence in the body politic. Fixed in his place in this body, and he is himself; a Roman with Roman firmness, with invincible courage, with unequalled valor, with a world-wide policy and a matchless diplomacy. Sundered from the State by exile, as was Cicero, or by some other violence, and he became like another man. He loses his characteristic life, and his existence is a burden to him. As he is himself a concrete being, he is accustomed to look at qualities in the concrete, as they are blended and illustrated in real life, in living and moving beings. He weighs and estimates them according to their relations to the State, whether they will or will not subserve its great interests (*usus popularis et civilis*). To him the truly valuable was the actual, the practical, the useful, and not

the speculative or the fanciful. Abstractions and theories, "Quiddities and Entities," scarcely found a place in his vocabulary, much less gave coloring to his thoughts, or bent to his mind. He looked upon the world as a great reality, as without him and not within him, as the sphere of his action, and the field of his toil. Such, in part, was the old Roman, whose high aims, iron will, fearless action, and unyielding faith, all centred in the favor of his country's gods, in the majesty of Roman law, in the omnipotence of the sword, and the universal sway of Rome. He could be a Romulus, Numa or Tarquin, a Cincinnatus or Marcellus, a Regulus, Paulus or Cato, a Camillus, Fabius or Scipio, a Caesar or Pompey, a Cicero or Maecenas, an Augustus or Antoninus, as the age in which he lived and other circumstances shaped his character and controlled his destiny.

In the Greek we have *life in the soul*. He is rapt in his higher, his inner life. He lives more in the world within than in the world without; more in his real self than in the State. Not that he is selfish or lives to subserve his personal interests, but simply that he loves his individuality and exerts himself to preserve it. He suffers not himself to be swallowed up by an irresistible national spirit, that, like the Roman, sweeping on and fusing down the most unlike and obstinate elements, forces them into a common mould. The Greek, from his earliest national existence, has been so situated as to preserve a separate personal existence, and the largest intellectual and moral freedom. He has grown up, not under a centralizing, aggregating and controlling power, but in distinct tribes or clans, vying with each other in excellence, and striving for an honorable supremacy. That he, as well as the Roman, lived for country, fought and died for it, is attested by the heroic achievements of Spartans and Athenians, at Thermopylae, Marathon, Salamis and Plataea. But while national glory inspired the Roman, *love of freedom*, not merely as opposed to subjection and slavery, but freedom of soul, freedom that would not brook insolence, tyranny, supremacy, freedom that asked for the fullest scope of the pure and exalted sentiments of the soul, freedom that would allow the development of a perfect manhood; it was this love of the largest personal freedom that nerved the Greek for the battle-field.

As counterpart to the world without, man has within a world of susceptibilities, powers and emotions; so that every outward combination of circumstances, finds an inward correspondent

condition. Beauty awakens the feeling of the beautiful, sublimity, of the sublime, deformity, of disgust.

"Format enim Natura prius nos intus ad omnem
Fortunarum habitum." — *Hor. Ars Poet.*

To have the outward act on the inner, and shape it, is a characteristic of the Roman. He is an "objective" being. He is in the highest and best sense imitative, appropriative, practical, centralizing. The reverse is true of the Greek. He is "subjective." He seems conscious of faculties within that are independent of the world without; that it is his nature rather to mould and shape, than to be moulded and shaped. Hence he is inventive, creative, Eutopian. He illy succeeds in the useful arts. For agriculture, commerce, jurisprudence, government, in which the Roman is mighty and which is his national strength, he has little aptitude. In the fine arts, poetry, music, painting, sculpture, architecture, he stands unrivalled. Through these breathe his largest freedom. The enchanting melodies, the flowing measures, the breathing tablet, the speaking marble, the majestic column, show his wonderful genius, a genius that rises above art and rule. While the Roman, as lord of the world, rules by his wise policy and arms, the Greek, as master, rules by his polished arts. He rules even his conquerors.

"Grecia capta, ferum Victorem cepit, et Artes
Intulit agresti Latio." — *Hor. ad Aug.*

The sense of the *beautiful*, the *fit* (τὸ κάλον, τὸ πρέπον), in the Greek, is exquisite. He drinks it in wherever nature presents it. He gives it embodiment and form in his arts of design. He becomes a Zeuxis or Apelles, a Phidias or Praxiteles, an Orpheus or Amphion, a Homer or Pindar, just as he happened to seize the pencil, the chisel, the lyre, or verse. In the use of all these, he has an air of unrestrained nature, attitude of "carelessness" and grace, of ease and despatch, that shows him the master, having a soul inspired with the *ideal*, the *beautiful*, the *sublime*.

In the Hebrew we have *life in the Divine*. The idea of God, of an Almighty Spirit, pure, infinite, that can be symbolized by no material image or form, that creates by his power, governs by his wisdom, regulates by his providence, pervades his whole nature, and is inwrought into his thoughts, feelings, volitions,

motives, purposes and hopes. This idea, like attraction in the harmonies of the universe, is a great *primary fact*, that underlies his social, civil and political character, toward which point or from which proceed all other elements developed in his private or public life. Whether he looks within or around him, above or below him, "GOD IS HERE" is fixed in his deepest convictions. From the idea of this invisible, all-seeing, wonder-working power, that operates upon and breathes through him, he neither can nor wishes to escape. It gives complexion to all his feelings and actions, inspires his music and songs, his history and proverbial philosophy, his legislation and rule, his wisdom in council and his prowess when called to the field of battle.

The Hebrew has life in the soul; nay more, for it proceeds to life in the Divine. That spirit which is within him, with all its wondrous susceptibilities and powers, he regards as inspired by the breath of the Almighty. He feels that it goes upward in its alliance with the Eternal Spirit, and he lives in it as in an inner and higher life that is hid in God. While the Greek receives his highest inspiration from nature, or from her powers and agencies deified, the Hebrew receives his from that Divine Intelligence that pervades all the operations of nature.

The Hebrew has life in the State, and this, too, proceeds to life in the Divine. For his idea of a State is that of a people whose bond of society is in God, whose social, civil and political interests are swayed immediately and directly by the Divine counsels; a *theocracy*, in which God himself is chosen by the people as king and lawgiver, and all rulers, whether judges, prophets, priests or kings, are only his vicegerents to execute his will.

While the mainspring of life in the Roman was national honor, in the Greek love of freedom, in the Hebrew it was socially and politically, not less than religiously, "THE FEAR OF THE LORD," not slavish fear, or cowardice, or pusillanimity, but reverential fear, whose prime elements are confidence and love. This fear was the highest wisdom, nay, the essence of it, inasmuch as it was potent to build and regulate life. It infused itself into the entire social and political fabric, giving it its uniqueness, gravity and strength. Hence the Hebrew is contemplative, rather than speculative or practical. All causes unknown and all effects, to him lie mediately or immediately in the unseen. His thoughts and conceptions, after ranging the world of matter,

mind and spirit, find their limit and home in God. He lives, moves and acts as one who is conscious of being under a higher and loftier inspiration than breathes from anything of earth. His chief attributes are reverence, trust, gratitude, submission, probity, justice, mercy and truth. Such, at least, was the old Hebrew when he showed his true nationality. He could be "The Father of the Faithful," "The Prince of God," "The Patriarch of Uz," "The Legislator of Heaven," "The Captain of Hosts," "The Prophet-Judge," "The Shepherd-Conqueror," "The King of Peace," "The Evangelical Seer," or "A Belteshazzar," according as he was placed in circumstances to have most prominently developed in him, trust in divine guidance; reliance on divine deliverance; patience and unflinching integrity under divine trials; meekness and wisdom in executing the divine commission; courage and valor in doing the divine behests; piety, honesty and sincerity in following the divine will; fearlessness, energy and military skill in fulfilling the divine command; wisdom and sagacity in administering the divine government; prescience and a lofty enthusiasm in developing the plan of divine mercy; or conscientiousness and decision in matters affecting the divine honor.

While the Roman character rises before us as if into a tower whose foundations are invincibility and strength, the Grecian into a majestic Corinthian column whose elements are beauty and grace, and the Hebrew into an holy temple whose pillars are "firmness and stability," not less distinctly are they marked by their degeneracy, tending, as it does, in the Roman, to avarice, ambition, cruelty and crime; in the Greek, to scepticism, vanity and voluptuousness; in the Hebrew, to a sickly sentimentalism, infaturation, obstinacy and guilt; and in all, to moral corruption and ruin.

2. The distinction hitherto drawn in regard to character, will constitute the true basis for distinction in language, inasmuch as the latter is only the outward expression or fruit, of which the former is the inward type. Whatever, therefore, we find as characteristics of a people, we may expect to see developed, with more or less fulness, in the words, forms, and grammatical structure of their language. For these receive their origin, or peculiarities, or inflection, from the different modes of conception which characterize a people; one people, from their nature, being more struck with one quality of an object, and another

with another. A single illustration upon this point must suffice. The generic term for *man* in Latin is *homo*, the *earth-born*; in Greek, ἀνθρώπος, the *up-looker*; in Hebrew, אָדָם, the *rudely-one* (the fair-faced, as allied to God); thus pointing, in their primary meaning, to those very characteristics already described: to the material, the actual, the practical, in the Latin; to the ideal, the speculative, in the Greek; and to the spiritual, emotional and contemplative, in the Hebrew. The Latin looks at *man* as acting, the Greek as thinking, and the Hebrew more as feeling. Other words, also idioms, structure and style might be used in illustration of the same fact.

To distinguish still further in regard to language, in the Latin is the voice of universal empire and aggressive war, of wise council and civil law, of facetious comedy and cutting satire, of patient history, and withering declamation. In the Greek is the shrine of original genius, the lofty epic and sober tragedy, an overpowering oratory and an eagle-eyed philosophy. In the Hebrew is the language of nature and God, of reason and conscience, of simplicity and earnestness, of Divine inspiration and prophetic song. In all, there is a voice speaking to man under different phases and conditions of his being, giving sound instruction, high impulses, and lofty aspirations.

The Latin was born for action, "*ad aliquod agendum*," for great and unwonted achievements, and hence was destined to rule the world through the senate-house, the forum, and the field. The Greek was born for speculative thought, and hence to rule the world by a far-reaching philosophy and a lofty imagination through the porches and academic groves. The Hebrew was born for reflection, to rule the world by a heavenly devotion, inspired song, sacred rites, and a true religion. All to rule by an incomparably rich, original, manly and fascinating literature, the like of which nations neither born nor unborn are likely again to furnish.

The Hebrew is marked for simplicity and durability, the Greek for elegance and versatility, the Latin for strength and utility; all, like statues of native rock, showing, in accordance with their respective genius, the workmanship of skilful and accomplished artists.

The Hebrew is first in the order of time, first in the order of thought and language, first in the true cosmography, first in the development of the great theory of human destiny. If not the

"primitive language," it gives evidence of being very near the original sources, whence have sprung, in the greatest purity, the myriad germs of thought and feeling which have expanded into the literature of the world. It is enduring as earth. It is like the *substructure* of its own temple, laid up of massive stone from the native quarry, by square and plumb-line, on foundations deep and broad, above which have crumbled edifices of varied beauty and size, yet itself abiding in grandeur and strength, unchangeable and unchanged, telling to every eye the story of its own antiquity, and still defying the conflicts of ages and the shocks of time. The Greek is like its own Parthenon, of Pentelic marble, with portico and fluted columns of nice proportions, and niches set with well-wrought images, and statues the exquisite workmanship of a Phidias and Praxiteles. The Latin is like its own capitol, a temple and citadel, set on high on the unyielding rock, itself an edifice of great magnificence and strength, but infinitely enriched by the spoils of many ages, and made the "domicilium," the home of all nations.

Such are the prominent characteristics of the three great languages of antiquity, each of which, in a marvellous manner, is a transcript of the mind of the people that used it. As a substitute, then, for these noble structures, who would offer the modern languages, Italian, Spanish, or German even, the most finished, all yet in a state of formation, and more or less anomalistic? When practicable, these also should be acquired. By most scholars, they will be, some or all of them. A knowledge of them is indispensable to finished scholarship. But withdraw the ancient languages, any one, or the three named, and a void is made in a college course, that no substitute can fill. Till ages shall have passed, and the arts and sciences shall have wrought the most wondrous changes on society, and on the now existing dialects of earth, the Hebrew, Greek and Latin cannot fail to have a large place in every wisely constructed system of education, and to perform an essential part in disciplining and furnishing those minds, that are to act in high places, controlling the destinies of the world.

3. As language is the print or outer form of which national character is the inner type, so *literature* is only the fuller development and expression of the same character. It is the complete volume or book, in which you have, through language, oral or written, every possible form of the unfoldings of the national

mind. In this you read the feelings, sentiments, thoughts, tastes, talents, knowledge, enterprise and position of a nation. It is national literature above all things else, that condenses into one grand outline all the *internal* features of national genius, the constitution under which the State is organized, the laws by which it is governed, the arts by which it is adorned, the poetry with which it is inspired, the philosophy by which it is regulated, and the religion by which it is restrained. He, therefore, and he only, who has mastered a people's language, and through it has received the spirit and breathings of its literature, can judge correctly of its genius, and hence it would be inadmissible, in the comparison we have instituted, not to characterize the literature of the Hebrews, Greeks and Romans. We shall do this as briefly as possible by drawing a figurative illustration for each, from the country and scenery amid which they respectively had their birth, development and growth.

Hebrew literature, in its main features, resembles Tabor, "a mountain apart," rising with a broad base from the earth. Its plains around vieing with the charms of Eden, are covered with the flocks of the Nomad, and with his tents glittering in the sun-beam. Its sides have sloping fields of green, and gushing springs whose waters softly flow like Siloa's brook; villages sweeping a broad horizon, cooling shades like Moreh's or Mamra's grove, or lofty cedars like those of Lebanon. About the rugged brow play clouds and storms. The lightnings flash, the thunders roll. Then wings of wind and chariots of fire, bear on, in terrible majesty, the omnipotent Spirit. But, above all, celestial beams of light penetrate the dark clouds, commingling with the sublimity of the scene the golden hues of the rainbow and the mellow tints of the morning, and fringing the clouds with a most gorgeous splendor. The whispers of the breeze and the rolling thunder waft to the ear the accents of the Eternal: "THIS PLACE IS HOLY GROUND."

Such is Hebrew literature, characterized by its distinct and permanent oriental impress, by the primeval beauty of its scenes, by the pastoral simplicity of its narratives, by the variety and richness of its illustrations, the comprehensiveness of its views of nature, the boldness of its figures, the awful sublimity of its descriptions of God, the celestial radiance of truth and love that play around his character and attributes, and, finally, by the sacredness with which it is invested, speaking in strains

soft and loud, but clear and unmistakable, that all is inspired of God.

In giving his word of truth to man, to enlighten and guide him, it pleased Divine wisdom, instead of divesting it of attractions, to invest it with the highest charms of history, philosophy, anecdote, parable, proverb, and, above all, breathing through all, in all, a poetry, whose internal harmonies and varied imagery, have a power never equalled, to sway the tender, the lovely, the lofty in man; a poetry that ranges, with more than human ken, the three heavens, the place of vapor and stormy wind, of the bright watchers of the sky, and of the home of the Eternal; that ranges the earth with its rocky pillars and firm foundations, the restless sea clothed with cloud and shut up with doors, the gloomy abodes of the shades with its bars and gates; nay more, a poetry that threads the deep, nice and intricate windings of the human soul, that world of mysteries within; a poetry, in fine, that sweeps through the boundless universe, subjecting to its power all essences, agencies and influences, human or Divine.

Greek literature resembles a broad island, decked in the beauty of a new creation, and emerging like the fabled goddess of beauty from the foam of the sea; as if a fairy-land, over which Loves and the Graces flit, and "the gold filleted seasons," with garlands of flowers, yellow sheaves and ripe clusters, spread their bright wings. Its coast is laved with shining waters, indented with bays, overhung with trees or a bold rock, like Taenarus. It has enchanting vales like Tempe, silvery streams like Peneus, fountains and waterfalls, the abodes of the Nymphs, cool groves, like those of Parnassus and shady Helicon, the seats of the Muses, and mountains also here and there towering upward, like Ossa Pelion and high Olympus. Then Aurora tinges the morning with her rosy fingers, Phoebus, in his bright chariot, gilds the day, and "Venus at night leads the choral dances under the full light of the moon."

Thus Greek literature, springing indigenous, from the confluence of tribal distinctions which at length coalesce in one; from the vigorous, manly and strong, though somewhat harsh, Doric and Aeolic on the one hand; from the smooth, soft and delicate Ionic, and from the easy, elegant, polished and refined Attic, stands forth incomparably rich and beautiful. It is characterized by originality, a lively fancy, brilliant imagination, graceful wit, poetic fire, historic strength, philosophic wisdom, a lofty elo-

quence, and a versatile genius. It is adorned with the purest mythical elements, that fear or fancy can furnish; its scenes of heaven, earth, sea, and the underworld, being invested, not with animation and life only, but with divinities that stir in all the visible and invisible powers of nature.

But Roman literature rather resembles a continent washed by two seas; one communicating with the nations of the ancient world, the other with those of modern times; the one bringing on its bosom from a high antiquity all that is valuable to be aggregated and appropriated to the uses of a dominant republic, the other sending over its waters exhaustless treasures for distribution, to enrich and adorn new States that lie beyond. The basis of this continent is as if Neptunian rock. Its ranges of hills and its high mountains are clothed with verdure to their summits. All is productiveness. The soil is deep and inexhaustible. The valleys are broad and fertile, yielding the richest variety of fruits. The lakes repose with conscious loveliness, embosomed among green hills, skirted with rich meadows, and bordered with pleasant bowers. The streams are deep and strong, rushing on to the sea with a full bank, uprooting rocks and trees; one while checked by obstacles, then sweeping away all barriers, and swelling on in a resistless tide till all is lost in the bosom of the ocean.

Such, in a figure, is the extensive, rich and diversified literature of the Romans. It is characterized by the many and varied sources whence it is drawn, culling from the entire ancient world; it is distinguished for the full streams of practical and theoretical knowledge which it pours into the bosom of all modern nations, enriching their language, shaping their constitution and laws; for the strong Roman character that underlies it, rendering it as enduring in its nature as the foundations of the earth; for the many men of eminence that shine in it, furnishing good models to the world of heroes, scholars and statesmen; for its richness and depth, giving the most wonderful growth to every form of thought and sentiment; for the number and variety of its authors, having a Plautus, with his pathos, taste and art; a Virgil, with his power of invention, picturesque description, appropriate diction, and lofty verse; a Horace, with his sweetness, tenderness and grace; an Ovid, with his luxuriance and ease; a Livy, with his historic, philosophic, yet pictured, page; a Sallust, with his sententious vigor; a Tacitus, with his terseness, depth and strength, with

his profound insight into the secret springs of action; and a Cicero, with his versatility, comprehensiveness and exhaustless resources of thought, language and illustration. It is distinguished alike for the irresistible power of its oratory, arts and arms, all swaying, not the forum, the senate-house, Rome, or fair Italy only, but the habitable world; for the limitless range and extent of its influence, finding no bounds so long as generations of men spring up, and minds are produced capable of feeling and appreciating whatever is lofty in aim, grand in conception, massive in its structure, fair in its proportions, beautiful in its finish, and useful in its bearing on the destiny of man.

Thus the character, language and literature of the three great nations of antiquity, whether viewed together, or nation by nation, show in a strong light the wonderful genius of ancient learning. They show that this learning opens the original fountains of knowledge, the best means of mental discipline, the brightest examples of talent, and the richest sources of intellectual culture and enjoyment. They show that that student is eminently wise, who, aiming at a high position in life, lays a broad and deep foundation by first storing his mind with the wisdom of the past. To do this successfully, he must come *directly* to the fountains themselves, being dependent neither upon translations, paraphrases nor commentaries. He must master the languages which are the only true and reliable repositories of national character and literature.

Alphonso, "the learned," who, when a youth, knew all that had been produced in the schools of Bagdad, used to say, that "Old age was best in four things: old wood to burn, old wine to drink, old friends to trust, *old authors to read.*" True, Hebrew, Greek and Roman authors have long been "dead." But their "genius" lives. Consult them in their own tongue, they will speak; speak to the intellect and heart, judgment and taste, imagination and will. Though necromancy was forbidden by ancient laws, it is allowed in these latter days "to ask counsel of the *dead*," and the hierophant of faith and knowledge, if he would teach truly the mysteries of religion and science, *must* call to his aid the "familiar spirits." "*Ultimum principium est originalis Textus.*" In all controversies on questions of history, law, literature, science, philosophy or religion, affecting the nations of antiquity, the *last resort*, is the original text, and that scholar or divine only, can feel strong in his views and positions,

who holds this fortress of strength. Through the inability of the earnest and honest advocate to avail himself of this resort, truth has often been disgracefully routed from the field, and error has proclaimed an undeserved triumph.

II. *Hebrew and Roman Learning treated comparatively with each other.*

Hitherto, in developing the genius of Hebrew and Roman learning, we have regarded especially the *internal* elements. We have glanced at some historical aspects of our subject, have marked the more general characteristics, especially of the Hebrew, and have compared the national character as the inner type of its genius, the language as the print or outer form, the literature as the open book in which we find the fullest expression of the national mind. In doing this, in order to show Hebrew learning and Roman learning in their true light, one early, the other late, one sacred, the other profane, it seemed quite necessary to introduce the Greek, having a character both sacred and profane, and occupying a position between the other two, whether considered historically or characteristically, as being exceedingly convenient for a comparison. In further prosecuting our subject, we shall have regard rather to the *external* elements, that have shaped or been inwrought into the national genius; to the *Country* as the native home of each people; to the *Capitol* as the national centre and head, and to the *Holy house* as the seat and expression of their religious veneration and worship. As these elements are more material, palpable and tangible in their nature, it will answer our whole purpose to prosecute the comparison as exclusively between the Hebrews and Romans. This we may do, in a literary point of view, without profaning the one, or wholly sanctifying the other.

1. Every nation must have its own peculiar home, and that home, whether the Delta of some broad stream, or the high mountain-ranges, or an intermediate table-land; whether to the north,

"Where late the summer breeze
Unbinds the glebe or warms the trees,
And lowering clouds always appear,
And angry Jove deforms the year;"

Or away to the south,

“Beneath the burning ray
Where rolls the rapid car of Day;”

Or at a place between,

“Where kindest Jove his gifts bestow,
Where warm, the genial winters glow,
Where spring, with lasting honors reigns,
To crown with joys the fertile plains;”

Wherever it be, by its sky, its soil, its scenery, its productions, it exerts a secret but powerful influence in the formation of mental, moral and political character. It is this chiefly that invests the physical features of a country with interest to the mind of a scholar. Being intent upon the causes of national character, he cannot overlook the curtains of its tent spread over it by day and by night, nor the carpet of green stretching away in landscapes and lawns, nor the bright waters that lave the shores, or the mountain-peaks that hide in the clouds, nor the soft breezes that are wafted with fragrance over the plains, or the terrific storms that lash the forests and sacred groves.

Canaan, “bright Canaan,” is the native home of the Hebrew; Italy, “sunny Italy,” the native home of the Roman. The one is the goodly, the holy land of Jehovah — PALESTINA — the land of the Phoenicians from the dwellers on the coast, of the Hebrews, of Israel, of Judah from the rightful proprietors of the soil. The other is the Saturnian, the Oenotrian, the Ausonian land — ITALIA — and the Lavinian shores. It is Magna Hesperia or the great western land; Magna Grecia, or Greece brought out upon a broader and richer soil. Such an exuberance of names, rarely exists, all of which awaken the most thrilling associations of lands celebrated in sacred and classic song, showing, in the one, the seat where “the Divine glory” rests, and, in the other, the seat whither “the star of empire” bends its way.

(1) Both lands have the waters of the Mediterranean playing upon their shores, and, while the lack of compass and chart with feeble craft forbid to measure the stormy Atlantic or broad Pacific, furnishing a suitable cradle for the infancy of navigation and commerce. Both have a sky “like the very heavens for brightness,” over which by day for most of the year, unclouded sunbeams play; the moon walks in her majesty by night, and the

stars shine out with unveiled splendor. Both have "perpetual spring and summer with months not her own." Twice a year the flocks produce, and twice the tree her fruits.

"Bis gravidæ pecudes, bis pomis utilis arbos."—*Virg.*

No torrid suns scorch the plains, no frigid winter binds them fast with ice and snows.

"Ver ubi longum tepidasque prebet
Jupiter brumas."—*Hor.*

Scarcely less "Italian" is the sky of Palestine than that of Italy. The "heat of the day" soon passes, and as the sun sinks towards his ocean-bed, refreshing and balmy breezes from the sea rise over the lands. Soft dews, like those of Hermon, or gentle showers, or the early and latter rains, are shed down upon the hill-top and valley. All nature teems with life and is vocal with songs of exultation. The fields stand dressed in living green. The trees of the wood rejoice. The air swarms with birds of every wing, from the sparrow that falls to the ground unnoticed, to the eagle that soars amid the gathering storm or makes the high crag his mountain home.

(2) Both lands have a mountain ridge running their whole extent, and giving to each physical features, that for variety, beauty, and boldness of scenery, rarely find a parallel. The one you follow by treading from the snowy Lebanon, over mount Naphtali and the high plains of Galilee, upon Tabor, Hermon and Gilboa; upon Carmel, Ebal and Gerizim, and then along the mountains of Ephraim and Judah till you descend into that "great and terrible wilderness where are scorpions and fiery serpents and no water." The other you follow by treading from the towering Alps along the unbroken ranges of the Apennines, till you come to "the Scyllean rage and rocks roaring within," or see beyond where "the glowing Vulcan kindles the heavy forges of the Cyclops." Both ridges alike send out spurs on the right and left, running down to the sea or river, and enclosing between them the most "fertile plains and dewy meads," or forming valleys, ravines and waterfalls, surprisingly picturesque and beautiful. Springs and fountains burst out from valley and hill, sending down streamlets that give freshness and verdure to widely extending lawns. Here the dense vine, married to the branching elm, is laden with clusters like those by "the brook of

Eshcol." Near by hang figs and pomegranates, or flourish the olive with its oil, or the palm with its dates. The sloping fields wave with wheat and barley, while the green hill-tops are covered with the herd. The clefts of the rocks swarm with bees, and "honey yields not to that of Hymettus." Everywhere "plenty flows from a full horn." The meadows are decked with the lilly, the rose and the myrtle, or are redolent with the thyme. Especially does the eye rest upon the plains of Jezreel, of Sephela, and of Sharon, upon the sides of Carmel and the valley of the Jordan, as diversifying the one land, and upon the valleys of the Po, the Tiber, the Liris, and upon the fat fields of Campania, that "certamen humane voluptatis," as signalizing the other.

"Neither Media most rich in groves,
Nor fair Ganges and Hermas turbid with gold,
Nor Bactria nor India, nor all Arabia,
Fat with frankincense-bearing soil,
Can vie with the praises of Italy.
* * * * *
Then hail Saturnian land! great parent of fruits.
Great parent of MEX."—Virg.

"Blessings above," the clear sky, the fragrant air, the dews, and rains, and "blessings beneath," the rich soil with its varied fruits, show that Palestine, too, is the "glory of all lands."

"Come, with me from Lebanon — with me from Lebanon;
Look, from the top of Amana — from the top of Shenir and Hermon.
An orchard of pomegranates — with precious fruits;
Cypress flowers with spikenard — spikenard and saffron;
Sweet cane and cinnamon — with all trees of frankincense;
Myrrh and aloes-wood — with all the chief spices;
A fountain of gardens." * * * *

"A land of corn and wine, a land of bread and vineyards, a land of oil-olive and honey."

(3) Both are *lands shut up*. They are safe homes for a nation in its infancy, when the prime elements of national character are germinating, and a retreat is needed far away from the spoiler, where no

"Proud Nimrod who the bloody chase began,
A mightier hunter and whose prey was man,"

could well make inroads, to change the forming manners, to overthrow the infant State, or to crush the germs of its greatness

and strength; where, in undisturbed tranquillity, it might mature into manhood, and the vices and corruptions of older republics not readily commingle. Mark what such a situation has done to secure the renown of ancient Egypt, hemmed in by seas and deserts, or the power of modern Britain, sitting an isle in the midst of the ocean, or the "young America," removed from the envy and rage of despots.

"The deadliest foe to man is man." How many a feeble colony, planted on some fertile shore, and growing in population, enterprise, commerce, and political importance, has, nevertheless, been crushed, or swept away by the overflowing scourge of hostile armies, because their exposed situation provoked the avarice or ambition of the conqueror!

Palestine and Italy were not *easy* of access for invading armies, nor were they readily reached by the luxury, vice and crime of oriental cities. With Libanus and Anti-Libanus on the north, their sides clothed with cedars, their tops with snow, or with the Amanus and its "Syrian gates," still further north; with the Euphrates and Syrian desert on the east, the great desert on the south, and the sea on the west, Israel long dwelt under his own vine and fig-tree, and "with the nations did not reckon himself." In this safe retreat he worked out the high destiny appointed by Heaven. He reached this spot by a dangerous and toilsome way, not over the sea, mid storm and shipwreck, like the Trojan exiles, but through a terrible wilderness. When reached, it was "a garden enclosed," in which "the vine from Egypt might be planted, take root, send its shadow over the hills, its boughs to the sea, its branches to the river, nor the wild boar of the wood devour it."

In like manner the Roman in infancy found shelter. On the east, south and west, was the "dissociabile mare," the broad sea forbidding intercourse. On the north, the Alps towering to the clouds, were for walls and bulwarks, checking invasions and arresting the tide of migrations, that else had swept in awful inundations over Italy, and left no trace of the early Roman name. These barriers were now and then burst, the "fatal beauty of Italy" was marred, and Rome herself was left a heap of ruins. But this did not occur till the home hedged in had given national strength and recuperative power.

"The mountains, seas, and stormy air,
Are the strong barriers of thy borders, where

Thou laugh'st at enemies; who shall then declare
The date of thy deep-founded strength, or tell
How safely in thy lap thy sons shall dwell?"

In such a home the Hebrew and Roman, respectively in accordance with his national faith, surrounded himself with a divinity. He invested his mountains and hills, grottoes and plains, groves and streams, with a presiding genius. A guardian spirit everywhere hovered over him, cared for him, watched his national destiny, blessed him in the city and field, in his basket and store. To him everywhere

"Soft echoes warble, whispering forests nod,
And conscious nature owns a present God."

Sheltered by such a home, both nations rose steadily and surely to that lofty elevation which they occupy in the history of our race.

(4) Still, that Being who shapes human destiny, and has ordained that the collisions and conflicts of life should give direction and mould to national as well as individual character, suffered that, within their borders, both nations should find hostile tribes, claiming the land by *prior occupancy*, with which, until subdued, must be maintained a vigorous warfare; such a warfare as would give nerve, and cement by a stronger national bond. The Hebrew, by a Divine command, in order to keep free from idolatry a pure religion, unsheathed the sword of extermination against the Canaanitish and gigantic races that covered the valleys and hill-tops, or hid themselves in the clefts of the rocks. By this warfare he was taught that his God was for walls and bulwarks, and that the high tower of his defence is in justice, mercy, and uprightness of life. The Roman, moved by his native valor, in order to extend his power, and sway Italy, unsheathed the sword of conquest against the old Latins, Sabines and Etruscans, and then against other domestic foes, and one after another, swallowed them up. By this struggle he was taught to regard the war-god Mars, rather than any other, as his parent and founder; to honor him as *Gradivus*, in his coat of mail, with sword and scaling-ladder, *striding* the earth. He was taught that he must buckle more tightly his shield, grasp more firmly his sword, and thus, with indomitable courage, hew out his own destiny through fields of carnage and death.

How terrible were these domestic foes, and stern their assaults,

to drive the foreigners from their soil, is sufficiently evident from the fragments of history that bring down, through the fabulous ages, their deeds and their names. Had not some Power befriended, easily they might have eaten up as bread those infant communities, which, recently arrived from the wilderness or from the sea, they looked upon with awful apprehensions as growing in their midst, in numbers and strength, far too much for their own safety.

To the Hebrew were remnants of a most ancient race, the Rephaim, Emim, Avim, Anakim, who had walled-towns of great strength, and other evidences of progress in the arts; men, too, of extraordinary stature, and, as their names imply, "disturbers," "devastators" and "terrors" to mankind. In addition to these, were the Canaanites and Perrizites, who had partly supplanted the gigantic races, and partly been incorporated with them; then the strong Philistines, who knew not how to yield.

To the Romans, in like manner, were remains of the old Pelasgic races, whose origin and history are wrapt in obscurity, who were not only gigantic, but advanced in the arts, as is evinced by their Cyclopean architecture, found at Cortona, Perugia and Cosa in Etruria, and at Corba and other places in Latium. But these races had been nearly supplanted by the Italian tribes, or incorporated with them, and the Roman found himself a small colony, joined by a band of refugees, and surrounded by the powerful Latins, Etruscans and Sabines, or by Ligurians, Umbrians and Opicans, by whom he must be swallowed up, or maintain against them incessant warfare.

Such was the condition to try the soul of the early Hebrew and of the Roman. In the one, it developed trust in that Power that stayed the sun in his course while victory turned against his enemies. In the other, it developed that iron constitution, resistless energy and lofty daring that subdued the world.

But this difference in the result of these domestic struggles should be marked: the Hebrew, descending from a single stock, and, by a solemn religious rite, kept distinct from the people of the land, must either exterminate or expel them, or allow them to remain by treaty as an entirely separate people. Not so the Roman. No sooner had the Trojan band gained footing on the Lavinian shores, than, through Latinus and Aeneas, first, by public treaty, then, by uniting their religion and gods, the Trojans and Latins are united into one people, and ruled at Alba

Longa. Again, when a colony under Romulus drew off from Alba Longa and founded Rome, three powerful people, Latins, Etruscans and Sabines, soon coalesce in one, and their language, religious rites, institutions and laws, become a sort of eclectic compound. Thus, while it was the Hebrew policy to separate and exclude all foreign elements, it was the policy of the Roman to draw together, combine and amalgamate. It was to incorporate into his own whatever of strength he had mastered in others. Hence, in tracing the *original elements* of national character, we should regard this difference. For we trace the Hebrew, as if from a single fountain issuing in one stream which flows on little changed in its character, except as it widens, deepens, and swells on in a stronger and stronger tide. The Roman we must follow as it issues from Trojan, Latin, Etruscan, Sabine, and then Greek sources, in its flow onward uniting and assimilating the most heterogeneous elements.

2. Having viewed the home of the Hebrew and of the Roman, with its mighty influence on national destiny, we next glance at the unrivalled *Capitol* of each, the seat of national splendor, wealth, learning and power, and hence the point whence issued a thousand influences, both acting upon and showing a nation's character and genius. The tendency to *centralization*, under some of the old forms of government, was greater than at the present day, as is attested by Babylon, Nineveh, Thebes, and other ancient cities.

(1) The position of Jerusalem and Rome proves that their sites were chosen in an age when other than vast commercial interests by sea controlled the choice. High and airy, especially the former, and far inland, they show that notions quite different from our modern ones, prevailed respecting the essential elements of growth and prosperity to a great city. The seas are now the highway of all nations; and a situation where, through harbors, straits, or broad streams, they cannot pour in their abundance, gives little promise of the future. Not so in olden time. The great lines of trade were over-land, by "the ships of the desert." The multitude of camels, the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah and of Sheba covered the land. The caravan, and not the steamer, poured in the spicery, balm and myrrh, the oil-olive and the Persian nard, the honey and nectar, all sorts of precious stones, pearls and gold, the silks and purples from a long voyage over land, into some convenient inland depôt, where they would

find ready distribution and sale. Hence arose Palmyra, Damascus and Petra as marts of trade, whose former magnificence is attested by the ruins of temples, palaces, theatres and sepulchres of solid rock or polished marble, that lie strown over their desolated sites. It is the changing tide of commerce that has left these and numerous other cities of the old world, as "habitations for owls and dragons."

In *that* age, then, human or divine sagacity penetrating the history of future generations, saw in the elevated position, the broad horizon, the pure sky, the picturesque region, the high rock as a citadel of defence, the crystal fountains, and above all, in some mark that it was a favorite abode of the presiding Deity, the sure presages of future greatness; and this sagacity led men, not to plunge into the bog or alluvion, whither the gallant ship could glide, but to ascend upward on some limestone ridge or granite pillar, over whose summit nature had spread a rich mold of earth, or woven an arbor of trees, or matted a carpet of unfading green. Here, under some sacred tree, as the broad terebinth or Luminous fig-tree, where altars had been reared for sacrifices; or the wolf, sacred to Mars, had nursed the outcast infants, men spread their tents, or drew their omens, or furrowed the ground for walls. Then, by the broad foot-path and a gate for the horse and his driver, the riches of the gentiles flowed in. Such were some of the auspices under which Jerusalem and Rome rose and flourished, the one the "City of the Great King," the other the "Mistress of the world." Under different auspices have flourished Alexandria, Venice, Genoa, London and New York, as emporiums of traffic by sea.

Nor until commerce changes its course, can Palmyra or Petra or Jerusalem or Rome, or cities similarly situated, live again in their ancient splendor. This change may come. The world has seen *one era of trade*, when it moved by mighty caravans over the highway of the desert; and, during this era, large cities arose, the arts advanced, and a mighty impulse was given to civilization. Now, a *second* era is passing. The ocean is the highway of trade. "In vain has God in wisdom cleft the lands by an ocean forbidding intercourse." In vain has he rolled boisterous waves, and spread stormy skies between the adventurer and the wealth of distant nations. "Audax — ruit per vetitum et nefas."

"No Laws or human or Divine,
Can the bold race of man confine."

The resolute son of Iapetus has brought down the *divine fire*, from its home in the skies. It has blazed through the genius of man, in Phœnician commerce, in Grecian art and learning, in Roman energy and rule, in Spanish adventure, and last of all and most, in Anglo-Saxon enterprise. It is now the Anglo-Saxon race that is daring to try all things, checked in his achievements by no law, human or Divine. Not only are "his impious ships," bounding over seas not designed to be touched, bridging oceans and uniting the most distant lands, but his indomitable skill is boring the granite mountains, and removing barriers that erst have made enemies of nations.

Under his hand, a *third era of trade* is advancing, destined more than to unite the facilities and grandeur of the two former. For not only is the highway of the seas by the *steamship* uniting the most distant lands, but the highway of the lands by the *locomotive* is uniting the most distant seas, and together they are making the whole human family one great nation of commerce and trade. The iron rail by easy grade is penetrating the highest table lands, winding up imperceptibly the rugged sides of mountains, and thus again carrying commerce and the arts, whither before not even the foot of the camel and dromedary with their immense burdens penetrated. The tide of human migrations is moving beyond harbors, coasts, and navigable streams, and man, not content to build his house and found his city in the low alluvion, which oft becomes the hotbed of disease, vice and crime, is ascending after the manner of olden time, to those fairy hill-tops, where Jupiter gives a clear sky, where bubbling springs send their waters into rich valleys, and distant prospects lend enchantment to the view. The ancient order is returning, and the "city set on a hill" is to become the light of the world, whither commerce with all the ease with which it floats upon rivers, lakes and seas, will flow abundantly, and whence religion, truth and

"Polished arts that humanize mankind,
Softens the rude, and calm the boisterous mind,"

will shed their influence afar over the families of the earth.

It is not mere speculation to conclude that new cities, like Salem, with a "mount of vision" and a "rock of Zion" for its fortress, or like Rome, the seven-hilled, the eternal city, are still to rise and flourish with more than ancient splendor, far removed

from the sea-board, where no galley with oars or proud ships can ride at anchorage, but whither the iron from the mountains, drawn into wires, will make a path for the lightning, that it may carry the news, or forged into bars, will make a way for the steaming, that he may force in the wealth of the nations.

In the light of commerce and trade, such is a glance at the auspices under which Jerusalem and Rome arose and flourished, the one to rule the world by its religion, the other by its arts and arms. In the light of the tactics of the age, their sites are not less remarkable, being both of them strong military positions, easily fortified, and giving to the besieged a great advantage over the besiegers. In the light of the genius of the times and people, a slight survey shows that neither city could well have chosen a more felicitous or magnificent seat for its greatness.

(2) Jerusalem is a city of *five* hills, Rome of *seven*, each hill having its own wonderful history. To the former, the hill of Zion, "the city of David," was the original city, around which in a crescent, lay *Acra* on the north, "the citadel" of king Antiochus, then *Bezetha*, "the new city," then *Moriah* on the east, the sacred temple-ground, with *Ophel* overlooking the Kidron. These rising in one broad and bold promontory between the valleys of the Kidron on the east, Hinnom and Gihon on the south and west, had other hills sweeping around them in a spacious amphitheatre; *Scopus* on the north, *Olivet* and mount of Offence on the east, the "hill of evil council" on the south, and the mountains of Judah and Ephraim along the west, furnishing the beautiful allusion of David: "As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about his people from henceforth even forever."

To the other, the *PALATINE*, the "*Roma quadrata*" of Romulus, was the original city, around which, almost in a circle, lay the *CAPITOLINE*, *Quirinal*, *Viminal*, *Esquiline*, *Coelian* and *Aventine*, sweeping in two ranges around a graceful curve in the Tiber. There was also the Pincian hill, or "hill of gardens" on the north, and the Janiculum with its high citadel, and the Vatican west of the Tiber, all of which were ultimately embraced within the walls of the city. Then, at a greater distance, appeared *Mons Sacer*, famed for the Secession, the Alban mount dedicated to Jupiter, and high *Socrate*, with its temple and grove, sacred to Apollo.

On these respective sites ~~three~~ *three* Jerusalems have stood, also three

Romes, each with its own thrilling history. The first Jerusalem was that of David and Solomon, into which wealth flowed from Tyre, Palmyra, Ophir, Tarshish, and the isles of the sea, till gold, silver and pearls were like the stones of the street. This was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar (B. C. 589). The second, still more splendid, was built by Zerubbabel, enlarged by the Macca-bees, vastly adorned by Roman governors, especially by Herod, and destroyed by Titus (A. D. 70). Then there is the modern city.

In like manner we have the plain but substantial Rome, destroyed by the Greeks under Brennus (B. C. 390), the Rome of marble, burnt and rebuilt with greater splendor by Nero, and modern Rome. Politically, we have the Jerusalem of Melchisedek, of the Jebusites, of the Jews, of the Romans, of the Christians, of the Saracens, and of the Turks. We have also the Rome of Saturn, of the Kings, of the Consuls, of the Emperors, and of the Popes.

(3) But alas! amid the vicissitudes of fortune thus marked, "how is the gold become dim and the most fine gold changed!" How do the cities sit solitary that were full of people! "The ways of Zion mourn." The streets of Rome, also, are overhung with the funeral cypress. The cities that now are, are not the cities of old.

"Zion is a plowed field." With what melancholy pleasure does the pilgrim "walk about Zion, tell her towers, mark her bulwarks, consider her palaces!" Little except nature's record in hill, valley and stream, does the Christian or Jew see to tell of former magnificence.

If he come from the Jordan by the way of Bahurim and the south, he may stop at En-Rogel, Job's or Nehemiah's well, where Jonathan with Ahimaaz once stopped in the time of Absalom's conspiracy, to send news hence to David, then fleeing "with the wings of a dove from the windy storm and tempest;" where also Adonijah made a great feast of sheep, oxen and fat cattle, that he might be proclaimed king instead of Solomon. From this well, taking the right by the Kidron, he may drink of "the waters of Siloa that flow fast by the oracles of God," visit Gethsemane under the brow of Olivet, and the tombs of prophets, judges and kings, hewn from solid rock; or, taking the left by Hinnom, he may pass Aceldama, "the field of blood," and Tophet, once horrid with the bloody rites of Moloch, and further up, the spacious pools of the Gihon, and the aqueduct from Solomon's pools.

He may enter the city. It has walls, but, except here and there massive stones in the foundations, little to show their ancient strength. It has gates, but not *the ten* of Old Testament times, or the *twelve* of Ezekiel's vision. It has public buildings, but the Mosk of Omar with the crescent, stands on the temple-ground, and an old convent or cemetery near the site of the splendid palace of Solomon or "The House of the Forest of Lebanon," and, in later times, the palace of Herod the Great. It has traces of towers; and Hippicus, on the west, may have been the "stronghold of Zion." But Phasaël and Mariamne, near the first or ancient wall, Antonio, on the north of the temple, and Psephinos, on the north-west of the city, have little to identify them as the bulwarks of strength in the times of David, Solomon and Uzziah.

He may tread the Via Dolorosa, which our Saviour trod with his cross; visit Golgotha, Calvary, and the Holy Sepulchre, but these only remind him of the sorrowful prediction of Christ: "Your house is left unto you desolate." Still unable to forget Jerusalem, he turns away with a saddened heart, exclaiming, in the plaintive language of Jeremiah: "Is this the city that men called the perfection of beauty, the joy of the whole earth?"

Scarcely more fortunate has been the city of the Caesars. Of the Regal period (244 years), nought but the old Tullian wall, the Italian prison overhanging the Forum, now the "Mamertine," and the Cloaca Maxima, show remains. Of the Republican period (461 years), some bridges, military ways, as the Ap-pian, and aqueducts, are traceable. Of the Imperial (507 years), more meets the delighted eye of the antiquarian. The Pantheon (A. D. 27), the Colosseum (A. D. 80), the Columns of Trajan and of Antoninus, the Arches of Titus, Septimius, Severus and Constantine, the Mausoleum of Hadrian (Castel di St. Angelo), and other structures, show something of their former grandeur. But yet how changed! Let the visitor, as he enters Rome, take his stand upon the tower of the Capitol, and turn his face to the north-west, towards the high dome of St. Peter's. *Modern Rome* lies mostly before him, covering the sloping sides of the Quirinal and Pincian hills, the ancient Campus Martius, and the Vatican hill, with the sides of the Janiculum, west of the Tiber. The seven hills of ancient Rome, except the Capitoline, on which he stands, are mainly behind him, strowed with ruins of towers and walls, temples and theatres, circuses and baths, palaces and

senate-houses, triumphal arches and columns. What associations crowd upon him, when he calls to his mind kings, consuls and generals, poets, orators and statesmen, whose names, from Romulus to the Antonines, have graced the city!

Let him first survey the Capitoline hill. He cannot identify the spot on which the Asylum, "the place of refuge" stood, nor that of the Capitolium of Tarquinius, the strong citadel of Rome, whose gates were of brass, and whose gilded dome shone from afar. The Capitol now standing, with its museum and palaces, though built from the designs of Michael Angelo, only mocks the man who would see the great sanctuary and citadel of Rome; where, under the shelter of the king of the gods, the senate, "the most grave and venerable counsel of the whole earth," had during kings, consuls and emperors held their deliberations in times of danger; where Cicero thundered against Catiline, and whither Pompey, Caesar, and other generals were led along the Via Sacra, and up from the Forum in proud triumph.

Let him now turn his back upon St. Peter's and the Vatican, and face the Colosseum or "great Flavian amphitheatre." *Ancient Rome* lies mostly before him. He first looks down upon the *Forum*; instituted by Romulus, decorated and enlarged by Tarquin, by consuls and emperors; a place for the assemblies of the people, for administering justice and transacting public business; surrounded by the capitol, temples of gods and goddesses, porticos and palaces; having within, the tribunal of justice, the twelve tables of the laws, the statue of Marsyas, flayed alive in contending with Apollo, as a warning to presumptuous complainants, the Rostra, adorned with trophies from the seas and with statues of distinguished men, from which tribunes, consuls, prætors and orators addressed the people, and, finally, having the Columnæ Rostratæ, to commemorate naval battles, "*navali surgentes ære columnæ*." But he looks in vain for such a forum as this. The very pavement on which the bustling millions of old Rome here trod, except some recent excavations, lies buried with fifteen or twenty feet of rubbish, gathered from falling columns, pillars and arches, which have been crumbling for centuries.

He next looks over the Forum at the Palatine hill, from which, near the Riminal fig-tree, Romulus drew his Auguries, on which he marked out with the Pomoerium his square city. But he sees nothing of Augustus's Imperial Palace, set with rows of oaks and

fronting the Via Sacra; nothing of the rich library, or of the temple of the Palatine Apollo, built of pure marble, or of the temple of Vesta, with its sacred fire perpetually burning; nothing even of the "golden house" of Nero, vast in its extent, reaching the Esquiline, richly adorned with precious stones, gold, silver, statues, paintings, and other costly ornaments, enclosing an immense pool like a sea, having a triple portico a mile long, and having, in the vestibule, his own colossal statue 120 feet high; nay, on this spot where, at an earlier date, could have been seen the substantial and elegant mansions of the Gracchi, of Crassus, Hortensius and Cicero, and most of the dwellings alike of Rome's senators and Rome's gods, which was, till the end of the Republic, Rome itself, the visitor can see little but the Farnese gardens or other miserable places to mock the genius of the past.

He need look no further to feel that the Rome he is now looking upon is not Rome. The "*Lux orbis Terrarum*," the "*Arx omnium Gentium*," the "Queen city of the world," is no longer found upon her seven hills. Long since, even before the Goth came (A. D. 476), the genius of Rome had fled. Nor is the holy city, the city of God, found upon Zion. When Titus entered with his legions, a sound of wings was heard from the inner temple, with a voice, "Let us depart," the spirit of Jerusalem fled. Still, these cities live, the one in Roman authors, the other in Hebrew song. They live in the history of the past, in the spirit still breathing from the illustrious dead, in every heart that is imbued with sacred and classical lore.

3. We must glance at the *Holy House*, as the seat of religious veneration and worship. All nations have their sacred places, sacred rites, sacred seasons, sacred things. Above all, the high sanctuary, as the special abode of Deity, where he is enshrined, worshipped, propitiated, sought, in its history, style of architecture, general arrangements, and costliness, gives a clue that nothing else can, to the moral and religious elements that enter into the genius of a people. The temple of Solomon, dedicated to Jehovah; the temple at Ephesus, dedicated to Diana; the Parthenon at Athens, dedicated to Minerva; and the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus at Rome, tell each a long and thrilling history in the development of those influences that shape national destiny.

(1) The Hebrews had one national temple, and that in all ages in the same sacred spot. The Romans had more than four

hundred, and the site of these, even the chief of them, very changeable. This difference was owing mainly to a pure Monotheism, on the one hand, divinely given, and to a mixed Polytheism, on the other, of both domestic and foreign origin, with a tendency to honor the Deity in every place of his supposed manifestation. It may here be observed, that while JEHOVAH is above comparison with all that are *called* gods, the Romans have given to the "king of the gods," attributes resembling those of the "god of the Hebrews." No nation of antiquity, unaided by Revelation, has more nearly reached the true notion of a supreme Being. With all the absurdities applied to him, it is probable that the more thinking and intelligent of the Romans regarded other deities so entirely inferior and subordinate, as really to make Jupiter the one god, and other gods only personations of the visible and invisible powers of nature. The temple of Jupiter only, can, with any show of propriety, be brought into a comparison with that of Jehovah, and that, too, by way of showing how infinitely the real glory of the latter exceeded that of the former.

While at Jerusalem we find three distinct temples on the same ground, the Jewish, dedicated to God, Adrian's to Jupiter Capitolinus (A. D. 136), and the Mosk of Omar to Mohammed (A. D. 636); and find the Jewish again under three forms, Solomon's (B. C. 1004), Zerubbabel's (B. C. 517), and Herod's (B. C. 17), at Rome we find *three* temples to Jupiter on different grounds.

The first was to Jupiter *Stator* (B. C. 746), near the old gate, "ad veterem Portam Palatii," on the north side of the Palatine hill, not far from the Ruminal fig-tree, built by Romulus to commemorate the spot at which Jupiter "stayed" the Romans in their flight before the Sabines, and saved the city. It was simple at first, but afterwards rebuilt and adorned in a costly style.

The second was to Jupiter *Optimus Maximus*, on the east side of the Capitoline hill, overlooking the Forum. The Power that had saved the infant city from the sword, and the Romans from disgrace, must, in their view, be exalted to a loftier seat, where his guardian presence would be more immediately felt, and his temple and the citadel be joined in one, for the eternal safety of Rome. Accordingly the Capitolium was founded by Tarquinius Prius, having, under the same roof, the temple of Jupiter in the centre, with a cell on the left for Juno, the "promoter of births,"

and on the right for Minerva, the goddess of wisdom and war, thus prefiguring the wonderful genius which should preside over Rome, as one whose great attributes were *strength, fecundity and skill*. This vast edifice, finished by Tarquinius Superbus from the spoils of Suessa Pometia, and dedicated by M. Horatius (B. C. 507), was the glory of regal, consular and imperial Rome. At first "majestic in its simple grandeur, the course of ages and the victories of three hundred years, gradually arrayed it in all that was splendid and precious." It was eight hundred feet in compass, built of volcanic rock (*Peperino*), surrounded by a double or triple colonnade, its doors of brass, its ceiling and tiles overlaid with gold, its whole interior embellished by Etrurian artists, and in its centre a statue of Jupiter, seated upon a throne of gold. It thus became the sacred heart of the empire, furnishing assurance that the empire should stand so long as the pontiff and silent virgin ascended thither with slow and solemn tread. Here kings, consuls, emperors and mighty generals, with the augurs, drew their auspices, sought the divine will, expiated crime, averted threatened calamities, or offered thanksgivings for victories, with sacrifices bleeding upon the altars. Hither when the Roman looked, his heart beat with a stronger confidence in his resources of power, with loftier patriotism, and with a holier devotion to his country's gods. But, like the Hebrews' temple, thrice was this house, with all its magnificence, laid in ruins, thrice rebuilt with greater splendor. Yet, like the Hebrews' temple, while receiving more and more outward splendor, "the Divine glory" from the manifestations of the presiding Deity was evidently departed, and omens and prodigies forboding evil, began thickly to gather around. This naturally directs our attention to another temple.

The third was to Jupiter *Uitor*. For Jupiter, at length apparently wearied with the vices of the degenerate Romans, sick at heart with seeing the best Roman blood flow by civil wars, by two most horrid proscriptions, by the murder of Pompey, the death of Cato, the assassination of Caesar in the senate-house, and, finally, enraged that Cicero, the philosopher, orator, statesman, the deliverer of Rome and pride of the empire, should fall by the hand of violence, Jupiter resolved soon to leave his old seat and in another place to enshrine himself as the "avenger."

Now there was one Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa, the son-in-law of Augustus Caesar, a contemporary and friend of Horace, Virgil

and Maecenas, a man of the highest civil and military rank, a high-minded and public-spirited man, who had done more than any other to embellish Rome and convert it from a city of bricks to a city of marble, into whose heart it entered to build this house for Jupiter. Soon, under his art and skill, it arose in matchless beauty and grandeur, north-west from the Capitulum, in the Campus Martius, where the Roman youth,

"In gramineis exercent membra Palaestris."—*Virg.*

by the "grace-giving Palaestra," had skilled their bodies and invigorated their minds for ages, where the green field then encircled it, where the yellow Tiber not far off sweeps around on the one side, and a broad amphitheatre of hills rises on the other. It is the PANTHEON (*παν θεϊον*), the "all-divine," the glory and boast of Rome.

"Mark how the dread Pantheon stands,
Amid the toys of modern hands,
How simply, how severely great!"

It was dedicated in the name and behalf of the Julian family to Jupiter Ultor.

"Pantheon Jovi Ultori ab Agrippa factum."—*Pliny.*

Still, Jupiter did not at once utterly desert his old temple, the Capitulum. For, as late as Domitian, the last of the Caesars, this edifice was rebuilt with more than former magnificence. But, if we are allowed to judge from the history of the Romans during the period of their decline, may we not conclude that the king of the gods dwelt in the Pantheon as the avenger, while he still lingered with a heartless interest about his former seat? For what is more manifest, in the counsels of the gods, than that, while Jupiter dwelt propitious in the Capitulum, the Romans were destined, during kings, consuls, Caesar and Augustus, to rise to the highest pitch of civil, military and literary renown? But, when the Pantheon was dedicated, their sun began to go down. Their decline in religion, virtue, and the arts, was accelerated. Soon "Omnipotent Father," looking forth from his lofty habitation, and seeing, instead of the old type of manners, a city full of discord, luxury, vice and crime, opened the gates and let in hordes of barbarians from the north to complete the ruin he had interposed to prevent, as the STATOR, the stay of the

young Roman State, while foes, pressing on every side, threatened its annihilation. As OPTIMUS MAXIMUS, he had seen it grow in *virtue* and *power*, till the world owned its sway. At length, as ULTOR, having retained his seat sufficiently long to *avenge* himself of the degenerate Romans, as well as of their foes, having suffered wave after wave of destruction to roll over them, and feeling now that his mission to this city and empire had been accomplished, that he was in the midst of a people *no longer his own*, did he not, in accordance with the Sibylline oracles, sell out all his right, title and interest in the Pantheon, his last seat, to his successor, the Pope of Rome (A. D. 607)? For manifestly the scene that had been acting in this matchless structure changes. "Jupiter exit, Pope enters." Now the Pantheon becomes the "Rotunda," and, with its lofty pillars and supernal dome, is consecrated to "Mary and all the holy martyrs."

(2) The respective sites and arrangement of these sanctuaries claim a passing notice. As MORIAH was the holy ground at Jerusalem, so the CAPITOLINE was the "Divine mount" at Rome. The former, first as the "Jehovah-jireh" of the patriarch, was doubtless a sacred grove with an altar on one of the "high places." Next as the "threshing-floor of Ornan," the grove had been removed and the naked peak exposed to the wind. After it was chosen by David, the peak, quite too small, was levelled down, walls were reared from the base, and thus enlarged at vast expense, it became the temple-ground.

So the Capitoline, first as the "Saturnian hill," was a sacred wood, resorted to for sacrificial rites, when Saturn, during the golden age, held sway far away in the west, "at the end of the earth, by the deep-eddying ocean." Next it was the Tarpeian hill, its steep precipice and name, an awful warning against treachery. Its rugged top was full of altars, chapels, and consecrated spots, severally dedicated to deities. A peak was levelled down, the sides walled up, and on an area thus formed, the great sanctuary of Rome was built. From a human head (*caput*) found in the excavations, the edifice was called Capitulum, and the hill, Capitolinus.

Both sites, then, were marked and held sacred long before they were graced by a high sanctuary. While the one, however, had been the place of idols, and the centre of superstitious regard, the other had been favored with the most extraordinary

manifestations of the Divine presence, and, as its name implies, was indeed "chosen of God."

The Roman temples, though magnificent structures, generally enclosed one apartment with altars and conveniences for sacrifice, and an image of the presiding deity, either in the centre with a paling, or in some recess or niche in the wall. But the Hebrew temple, in its outer courts and inner apartments, in the beauty and perfection of its arrangements, so far exceeded the Roman, as to furnish no small evidence of itself, that it was planned by a Divine Architect, and was the earthly seat, not of an idol, but of the God of heaven.

"Three solemn parts together twine,
In harmony's mysterious line,
Yet all are *one*."

The Trinity in the unity of God, Father, Word, and Spirit; the triplex heavens, lower, upper, and highest; the three-fold division of the universe, heaven, earth, and hell; the triple nature of man, body, soul, and spirit; his triple destiny, life, death, and immortality, are all so perfectly symbolized, not in the number only, but in the nature and uses of the respective apartments, that the Hebrew could not but feel that all had been arranged by God. Then, as he passed through the courts, first, into the porch, with its high ceiling and lofty pillars of "firmness and strength;" secondly, into the sanctuary, where the lamp of God, sparkling with gold, goes not out, where the golden table is set with show-bread, where the altar, overlaid with gold, sends up grateful incense; and then passes into the most holy place, where the cloud of the Divine glory dwells, where Cherubim veil their faces over the mercy-seat, he could not but feel more and more that this is, indeed, none other than God's house, that this is the true temple on earth, foreshadowing a higher not made with hands.

Such temples, in such sites, standing for a series of ages, and acting incessantly with a sort of Divine energy, upon the religious sentiments, patriotic feelings and public taste of the Hebrews and Romans, must have been one of the most marked outward expressions of national character, and, at the same time, the most efficient of those causes which have wrought upon the genius of their literature, to elevate and enrich it.

In treating comparatively the external elements, we have seen the lands of the Hebrews and of the Romans, though differing,

rising before us both of them like some enchanted ground on which nature has delighted to lavish the choicest and richest of her gifts. We have seen their Capitols, though varied in character, respectively springing up in the choicest spot which beautiful lands could furnish, and shining forth from the heights of the earth with a light and splendor that both awed and dazzled the nations. We have seen their high sanctuaries, though one is the abode of God and the other of an idol, both lifting their columns, strong walls and high domes from the most sacred spot within their Capitols, and sending for ages their mighty pulsations through the entire body politic, inspiring a religious veneration that was potent to restrain and mould the national mind. Such a national home, political head and sacred heart acting upon, and inwrought into, national character, language and literature, whether looked at separately or in combination, show something of the genius of that learning which the Hebrews and Romans have furnished the world, and the student who is aspiring to the lofty position of finished and independent scholarship, must drink deeply of this ancient learning. To acquaint himself properly with the history, character, language and literature, and with the home, head and heart of the Hebrews and Romans, so as to be able "to draw thence for himself and country what he should imitate, or thence learn what he should avoid as base," he must resort to the original sources. He must

"Quaff the pure fountains of the Hebrew muse,
Quaff the pure fountains of the Roman muse."

In this way, and in this only, can he see in its true light the exalted genius of ancient learning. It is in the *college* and through it, that this genius is made to shine forth in its brightest effulgence. It is in this sacred retreat that the shafts in the mine of knowledge are sunk to their greatest depth. It is here, as from an armory furnished with weapons of burnished steel, that the youth are girded with their mightiest strength, to battle valiantly under the banner of truth. The college, the mental gymnasium, next to the church, is the great institution of modern times, to promote the march of a true civilization. It is the grand seat and focus of science and literature; the revealer of law, of the law of matter, the law of mind, and the law of God. It furnishes the fullest resources which the world has at its command for developing mind, for unfolding truth, for the right inter-

pretation of the ways of God and of the word of God. Hither, then, when the youth comes, with his soul kindled with high and holy aspirations, while here he seeks such preparation as will best fit him for posts of honor and influence, while he aims in the highest and best sense to become "the man for the times," not for *this* time only but for all times, let him remember that "*a new language is a new world*," that it opens new forms of thought and feeling; nay more, let him remember that he who has mastered a new language in its letter and spirit, has, in the very act, had as if a *new soul* breathed into his own intellectual nature, to enhance his immortal being.

ARTICLE VII.

THE CITATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW.

Translated from the German of Tholuck, by Charles A. Aiken, Resident
Licentiate, Andover.

[THIS translation is made from the third edition of the author's treatise on "The Old Testament in the New," which is usually found as an appendix to his Commentary on the Hebrews. The preceding edition of the appendix was translated with the commentary, and published in the "Cabinet Library," of Messrs. Clark, Edinburgh, in 1842. The treatise has since that time been entirely remodelled (1849), and is, in its present form, in Germany, the standard discussion of this important and difficult subject. The fact of a former translation seemed to render desirable a new translation, rather than a mere abstract, as had been intended. Here and there a quotation or reference has been thrown into a foot-note; and one omission will be found noticed in its place. The high reputation of the author and the importance of the subject will be a sufficient justification of the attempt to lay this discussion before the readers of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. — TR.]

§ 1. *Historical Introduction.*

The way in which all the writers of the New Testament, and especially the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, use the expressions of the Old Testament as proofs, is to us somewhat striking at the stage of development which exegesis has now reached, inasmuch as the passages of the Old Testament thus employed, have frequently a sense which seems to make them inappropriate to the argument, and, indeed, for citation at all in the connection. The Arminian theologians had, in their time, in support of the *historical interpretation* which they advocated, called especial attention to the fact, that among Jewish authors a like arbitrariness in the application of the Old Testament prevails; that they also explained passages of the Old Testament, and adduced them as proofs, or at least as parallels, altogether without regard to the original context. "So much every one perceives," says the Fragmentist, at the end of the last century (on the Design of Jesus and his disciples, p. 176), "that unless one is ready to assume beforehand, on the ground of his faith in the New Testament, this principle,—this passage speaks of Jesus of Nazareth,—no single one of these quotations proves anything, but that they all in their natural sense speak of quite other persons, times and events." Whether now, under the influence of the imperfect cultivation of the age, the Old Testament, in the passages in question, was expounded by the apostles, by Christ himself, generally in inconsistency with the connection, is to appear in the course of the following examination. True, special investigations are never undertaken without certain dogmatic presuppositions, more or less fixed; on the other hand, the results of the inquiry exert a reflex modifying influence upon former convictions, as here upon the Christology, and the doctrines of revelation and inspiration.

As long as the absolute freedom of the authors of the New Testament from error, stood fast as a premise unquestioned by interpreters, on account of the assumption of an *inspiratio literalis*, the interpretation and application of the Old Testament given in the New, must be the standard for Christian exposition. This was then the problem: to discover, in any possible way in these passages of the Old Testament, the specific Christian sense which had apparently been found in them by the

writers of the New Testament. Two methods were here pursued. Without regard to the connection, one portion of the earlier interpreters seek to establish the specifically Christian sense as that historically given in the Old Testament; the other, believing that these passages of the Old Testament must be understood in the first place from their connection, assume a double sense, a *ὑπόνοια*. Some follow now the one, now the other mode of explanation; so in the early church, the expositors Chrysostom and Theodoret, who occupy middle ground between the Alexandrian and the elder Antiochene schools. Yet Chrysostom expressly lays down this canon, that the connection is sometimes suddenly interrupted by a historical reference of the New Testament, that the discourse refers partly to circumstances of the time, partly to the future.¹ With equal measures of orthodoxy the one class of commentators, nevertheless, at times, comes into sharp conflict with the other. While Calov, alluding to the citation in Heb. ii., says on Isa. 8: 17, 18: *sunt verba ipsius Domini, habemus enim interpretationem indubitatam*, and remarks on the citation in Heb. 1: 5: *non sensum geminum habet, sed ut omnia scripturae loca unicum tantum, quia spiritus sanctus non Apollinis more locutus ambigue sensum diversum iisdem verbis occultavit*; and, accordingly, on account of Matt. 2: 15, 18, finds in Hos. 11: 1, Jer. 31: 15, a prophecy of those events of the New Testament; the no less orthodox Chemnitz declares, on Matt. 2: 15: *coacta et contorta est eorum explicatio, qui contendunt Oseam in Matt. 2: 15, de solo puero Jesu vaticinari*; and Schöttgen on the same passage: *nemo negat haec verba proprie de populo Israelitico intelligi debere*. Among the early writers there belonged to the first class Augustine,² Jerome, Cyril Alex., Luther,³ most of the Lutheran interpreters, so Tarnów, Seb. Schmidt,

¹ He says on Psalm cix.: *Περὶ τίνος ὁ ψαλμὸς εἴρηται; ἕνα περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδα — τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ περὶ ἑτέρων · καὶ γὰρ οὗτος προφητείας πάλιν τρόπος ἐστίν. — καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο προφητείας εἶδος, μεταξὺ διακρίπτειν καὶ ἱστορίαν τινα ἐμβάλλειν, καὶ μετὰ τὸ ταῦτα διεξιλεῖν πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ πρότερα ἐπανέναι.*

² Clausen, Aug. scripturae sacrae interpretes, p. 159.

³ Yet Luther follows in this respect, as in others, no fixed rules of hermeneutics. In the Psalms he applies the words everywhere to Christ, so that he, e. g., in Ps. 102: 27, which is applied to Christ in Heb. 1: 10, refers "but thou art the same," to the fact, that God incarnate is no other than God in eternity. On the other hand, he does not allow himself to be in the least bound by the application of Isa. 8: 14 by the apostles to the Messiah, 1 Pet. 2: 8. Rom. 9: 33, but in the interpretation of Isa. viii. treats the expression as a "*locus communis*," thus: so

Calov, A. H. Francke, in his exposition of the Psalms, and others; and, among the Reformed theologians, prominently Surenhus, who has applied this mode of exposition to all the citations from the Old Testament in his *βιβλος καταλλαγῆς*. Even down to the time of Andreas Cramer (1757) on account of the citation in Heb. 1: 10, the Messiah is regarded as the subject of Psalm cii., and, in yet more recent times, on account of the quotations in the New Testament, the Psalms in which the singer speaks in the first person are regarded by many as Psalms in which the Messiah is introduced as speaking; so Dereser, Kaiser, Klaus, Hengstenberg, in the Christology. Yet more widely extended in the early church was the assumption of a *double sense*; its advocates were Origen, Eusebius Cæs., Basil, Gregory of Nyssa and of Nazianzen, Ephraim in the Mesopotamian school of interpreters; in the Latin church, Hilary and Ambrose, and, as has been already remarked, to some extent, Chrysostom and Theodoret. Psalm lxix., e. g., according to Theodoret, treats, in its proper sense, of the miseries of the Jews in exile, typically, of the Redeemer; Psalm viii., according to Chrysostom and Theodoret, primarily of man in general, *κρυώτερον* of the first born of the human race, of Christ. The majority of Catholic interpreters, also, belong to this class. The most of the Reformed commentators, Zuingli, Pellicanus, Calvin, Bucer,¹ Cocceius, also, attached themselves to it, for the sake of the historical interpretation. Melancthon, also, on Ps. 22: 4, follows this method of interpretation. By Bengel this principle of hermeneutics is thus expressed (Gnomon on Matt. 1: 22): *saepe in N. T. allegantur vaticinia, quorum contextum prophetarum tempore non dubium est, quin auditores ex intentione divina interpretari debuerint de rebus jam*

soon as one turns aside from the faith, we stumble at all the miracles and words of God, and adds: the apostles have in 1 Pet. ii. Rom. ix., applied this general expression to a particular thing. He also explains Isa. 8: 17, 18, not according to Heb. ii. of Christ, but of the prophet (Walch, VI. p. 121 seq.). The same free manner, regardless of consistency, he uses with regard to the language of the apostles, when he says on Matt. xxiv.: Matthew and Mark confuse the two (the end of the world and the destruction of Jerusalem), do not observe the order which Luke has preserved (Walch, XI. 2496).

¹ Zuingli on Matt. 2: 18, says: *evangelista detorquet haec verba ad Christum, omnia enim quae in Vetere Testamento etiam vere sunt gesta, in figura tamen contigerunt et figurae fuerunt, in Christo omnia consummantur et vere implentur.* Bucer, after much hesitation on the question, whether the historical sense is in all the Psalms to be regarded as the primary, decides at length in the affirmative, with the words: *veritati enim nihil officit, et facit omnia clariora.*

tum praesentibus. Eadem vero *intentio divina longius prospiciens, sic formavit orationem, ut magis proprie deinceps ea conveniret in tempora Messiae* et hanc intentionem divinam apostoli nos docent. Bengel, accordingly, explains the citations, Matt. 2: 15, 18, with the remark, which may, however, be understood also in a freer and modern sense:¹ unius dicti sensui minor et maior non unius temporis eventus respondere potest, donec vaticinium *exhauritur*. Among living commentators Stier is the only one who maintains the doctrine that two or even more senses were intended by the Holy Spirit as author of the Scriptures.

Especially in Calvin do we see the conviction pressing upward, that in many instances, like Matt. 2: 18. Rom. 10: 6 seq. Eph. 4: 9. Heb. 2: 6—9. 4: 4, the passages of the Old Testament are not to be at all regarded as prophecies, but *are used by the New Testament author merely as the substratum for his own ideas.*² In this way an expedient would be suggested for the explanation of passages of the Old Testament according to their connection, without accusing the author of the New Testament of a *παρεμνήναι*. The earliest fathers of the Antiochene school, Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsueste, are, as it appears, still more committed to this principle. As they attached special importance to the *ἀκολουθία*, i. e. the sense gathered from the connection, they find in the Old Testament but few prophecies that relate properly to Christ, — Diodorus only three or four Messianic Psalms. Kosmas Indicopleustes, who follows Diodorus, declares it not allowable to refer, in the Psalms, aphoristically, part to Christ, part to other persons, it being an unworthy assumption, that, in the same Psalm, here the experiences of the Lord, there those of his servants, are depicted. Therefore, where others find the Messiah to be the exclusive or the coördinate subject,

¹ Nitzsch, System of Christian Doctrine, 5th ed. p. 88: the more there is that is typical contained in a prophecy, so much the more does it await a various and gradual, a very near and a very remote fulfilment, e. g. the prophecies of Ezeziel and of the second part of Isaiah.

² He remarks on Heb. 2: 6: respondeo, non fuisse propositum apostolo genuinam verborum expositionem referre. Nihil enim est incommodi si allusiones in verbis quaerat ad ornandam praesentem causam. Quemadmodum Paulus cum Rom. 10: 6. testimonium citat ex Mose: quis ascendit in coelum, etc., statim non interpretationem sed exornationem attexit de coelo et inferis, etc. While he attempts in Matt. 2: 15, to point out more accurately the typical element, on verse 18 he remarks only: non intelligit Matth., illic praedictum fuisse, quid facturus esset Herodes, sed Christi adventu renovatum esse luctum illum.

these interpreters abide by the reference to David, Solomon or Zerubbabel, and are consequently accused, even by Chrysostom and Theodoret, of Judaizing. The citation of other passages by the apostles is regarded as mere accommodation, *ex simili*.¹ In all probability the justification of such applications and parallels was based on a reference to the complete organic parallelism of the Old Testament and the New; such as Theodore of Mopsueste refers to in the preface to his exposition of Jonah (Theodori Mopsv. quae supersunt ed. Wegnern, T. I. p. 277 seq.).

This mode of treating citations was carried to the greatest extent in its application by the Arminians; see Grotius on Matt. 1: 22, Episcopius on Matt. 2: 15, and especially Wetstein on Matt. 1: 22. According to the manner of Jewish authors, *isa nlyrowdñ*, they say, introduces a significant simile.² The same conclusion is reached in the full, though irresolute, discussion of the citations of the Old Testament in the New, in Eckermann's Theologische Beiträge; see particularly II. 213. The period of illumination had meanwhile, in order to reconcile the irrationality said to be found in the Scriptures with the authority still ascribed to them, brought into vogue the theory of *accommodation*, which was employed especially to excuse the application made of these citations. "It is for the sake of the Jews," says Semler (in "The last Confession of Faith concerning the Christian and natural religion," p. 246), "that passages of the Old Testament are adduced in the New, that they might attach a wider significance to their former narrower interpretations." On 1 Cor. 10: 4, he remarks, after adducing some Jewish legends: haec talia, ingenio Judaico propria, a Christiana vero mente plane aliena, non

¹ "Ὅσα δὲ ἕτερα, says Kosmas (Montfaucon collectio nova Patrum II. 227), ἐξέλαβον οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐκ τῶν ψαλμῶν, οὐχ ὡς εἰς αὐτὸν κυρίως εἰρημμένα ἐξέλαβον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀρμόζοντα τῇ ὑποθέσει· οἷον· διμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμῖντι μου (Ps. 22: 9) — οἷον ἐποίησε καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος, τὴν χρῆσιν Μωυσέως μεταβαλὼν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπόθεσιν (Rom. 10: 6) — μεταφράσας τὴν χρῆσιν ὡς ἀρμόδιαν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπόθεσιν. Theodore of Mopsueste judges in the same way of the passage from the Psalms in Heb. 10: 5, which refers, he says, properly to the Jews in captivity: μεταλλάξας οὖν αὐτὴν ὡς ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ ταύτη φησὶν, κ. τ. λ. (Fritzsche, Theod. Mopsv. in N. T. comm. 1847, p. 169).

² Hammond on Matt. 2: 23: respondeo, aliquando prophetias dici impleri, etsi stricte ac proprie et primario prophetiae sensu non implentur, sed latiori, cum aliquid accidit cui accommodari possunt vel quod earum memoriam in mentes hominum revocant.

miramur Paulum isto tempore non refutare, *quia illis utendum erat καὶ ἁρθρῶς πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους*. The parallelism with the Jewish priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews is nothing but an adaptation to Jewish readers, to wean them more entirely from their old notions (Freiere theol. Lehrart, pp. 111. 447). The same principle is held with reference to the argumentation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, by Griesbach, Ernesti, and, to a great degree, by Stuart. After the authority of Scripture had been given up, "illuminated" theology, which now appeared as Rationalism, began to speak of accommodation to Jewish prejudices; the theological partialities of that period were ascribed to the apostles themselves. On the way to this result we find Clericus, when he says of the citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews: *solebant Judaei pleraque magnificentiora promissa in V. T. de Christo interpretari sensumque mysticum in iis quaerere. Credibile autem est, loca, quae huius Ep. scriptor de Christo explicat, dum sensum eis mysticum adsignat, sic vulgo etiam a Judaeis intellecta esse, certe partim*. That the apostles, in the passages of the Old Testament cited by them, found genuine oracles relating to Christian events, and this because they were led astray by the perverted modes of exposition prevailing among the Jews, is maintained in the article in Eichhorn's Bibliothek on "Accommodations in the New Testament" (V. 420 seq.). This view is carried out by Döpke in his "New Testament Hermeneutics, Part I. 1829." In exegesis, it was applied especially by Rückert, Röth Ep. ad Hebraeos, Böhme in his comm. in Ep. ad Hebraeos, Meyer, Fritzsche (first with reference to Matt. 1: 22); by these last two with manifest prejudices against the New Testament authors.

A certain relationship between the apostolical and the Jewish hermeneutics could no longer be denied. The decided majority of commentators within the last twenty years, adhering to a more conciliatory orthodoxy, have gone back to the method of the elder Antiochene school. On the one hand it is conceded, that the Old Testament expressions quoted have in their connection a different historical relation; on the other it is contended, that the charge of a groundless arbitrariness can be raised against the applications made in the New Testament. Reference is made to the organic parallelism existing between the Old Testament and New Testament economies, by virtue of which a certain degree of truth attaches to these several quotations of Old Tes-

tament passages. From a more rational point of view this principle is applied to the arguments drawn from the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews, by De Wette "on the symbolical typical style of teaching in the Epistle to the Hebrews," in No. 3 of the Theol. Journal of Schleiermacher, De Wette and Lücke. Bleek follows him in the article "on the dogmatic use of passages of the Old Testament in the New Testament," Stud. and Krit., 1835, No. 2; compare his Commentary on Hebrews, II. 108 seq. Billroth, also, in commentary on 1 Cor. 1: 19, insists on this organic mode of conceiving of the relation of the two Testaments in judging of separate citations. The same view, only that it rests on a more positive dogmatic basis, in Bengel's style, is developed by Olshausen "on the deeper import of Scripture," 1829, and is applied in his exegetical writings. Beck agrees essentially with Olshausen, in his "attempt at a pneumatic exegetical development of the ninth chapter of Romans, with a supplement on the pneumatic exposition of Scripture" (1833, of his Lehrwissenschaft, II. 360 seq.). With the same fundamental principle, yet with results which differ but little from the rationalistic view of prophecy, Hofmann unfolds the organic connection between the Old Testament and the New, and discusses the nature of prophecy, in his work "Prophecy and Fulfilment" (I. 1841, II. 1844); cf. the criticism of this singularly confused work in Delitzsch's "Biblical prophetic Theology" (1845), p. 172 seq. Inasmuch as Hofmann insists that prophecy never reaches out beyond the then present field of view, and that it is only within this that the Christian idea is obscurely presaged, there remains only typical prophecy possible. By this so-called *organic* mode of exposition, that which lay at the basis of the old assumption of a double sense, a *ἐνύωμα*, is brought out more clearly. It likewise gives its due weight to the historical connection of the Old Testament text, and, on the other hand, vindicates the New Testament citation from the charge of mere subjective, wanton arbitrariness. This latter advantage is so far from being impaired by the admission that this mode of citation is characteristic of Jewish development in the apostolic age, that a justification must rather be accorded to this parallelizing Jewish exegesis, to a certain degree, which, it is true, is often exceeded.¹

¹ Many of the earlier expositors who defended the double sense, made, at the same time, the admission, that the Apostles' mode of citation was that then prevalent among the Jews. — See Schöttgen on Matt. 1: 16.

The orthodox theology of the church has been gradually coming round to this view. The change in Hengstenberg's opinions was first expressed in an article in the *Ev. Kirchenzeitung*, 1833, Nos. 23, 24, where the principle is laid down, that the idea which forms the basis of a prophecy is to be distinguished from its realization in time. This canon is satisfactorily applied in Vol. III of the *Christology*. The prophet Elias, announced in *Mal.* 3: 1, 23, is not directly John the Baptist; it is the personification of the preaching of repentance, which must precede salvation (*Christol.* III 441). *Hag.* 2: 6 does not refer directly to the period of the New Testament, but conveys the idea, in accordance with which Hengstenberg explains *Heb.* 12: 26, that the heathen are to be brought to repentance by a desolating judgment of God on the heathen world (as above, p. 337). The explanation according to which *Joel* 3: 1, 2, as quoted in *Acts* 2: 16, receives its sole fulfilment in that event, is pronounced (p. 190) "gross, wooden, leathery;" the fulfilment reaches rather as far as the subject itself, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. According to Hengstenberg's more recent interpretation of the Psalms, the application of the Psalms to the Messiah by the New Testament, in those passages in which the singer speaks in the first person, rests on this principle, that these passages are fulfilled in the Messiah, inasmuch as they describe the righteous man according to his idea. Otto von Gerlach, also, in his popular commentary, in connection with *Matt.* 2: 16, gives the following abstract statement of the idea of prophecy: The word *fulfil* in this and similar passages does not convey the notion that the words introduced from the prophets contain a prophecy which finds its fulfilment only in the single events before us. Every word of God contains rather an idea which is realized whenever that which it expresses becomes in greater or less degree actual (see Bengel, as above). So even in this work of a Jewish missionary, "*Exposition of the New Testament*, by C. Teichler" (Berlin, 1847). We may then regard this organic biblical mode of treating the citations from the Old Testament in the New Testament as solely prevalent among biblical and ecclesiastical theologians.

‡ 2. *The Citations of the Old Testament in Jewish authors.*

The mode of using the Old Testament, prevailing among Jewish authors, is certainly in the highest degree arbitrary. Authorities at our command have not hitherto been sufficient to exhibit fairly its characteristics. Döpke's work, "*Hermeneutics of the New Testament authors*," 1829 (properly rabbinical hermeneutics, with which he discusses that of the New Testament), is merely an uncritical compilation of passages, and needs very much to be sifted. The most thorough discussion of the subject, but unfortunately very diffuse and uncritical, especially in Part 2, is found in Hirschfeld's "*Spirit of the Talmudic interpretation of the Bible*" (Part 1. *Exposition of the Halacha*, 1840; Part 2. *Exposition of the Haggada*, 1847). Geiger's treatise, "*The relation of the natural sense of Scripture to the Talmudic application of Scripture*," in the *Scientific Journal for Jewish theology*, Vols. V., VI., gives more critical results. Of an earlier date, *Halichoth Olam*, by R. Levita, edited by Bashuysen, 1714, is to be consulted for details; and Wähner's *Antiquitates Sacrae*, 1743, gives a very accurate survey of the subject.

The Rabbis were not content merely with quoting passages severed from their connection. In order to press from the Scriptures new sense and new allusions, ingenuity resorted to many artifices, transposition of letters, interpretation according to their numerical value, and even exchange with similar letters and words, etc. In their hyperbolical way, some maintain that every verse can be explained in 49, 60, or even 600,000 ways (Eisenmenger's *Judaism unveiled*, I. 454 seq.). A learned Jew from the interior of Russia was once, in the author's presence, pressed with the assertion, that Moses was also a sinner, a murderer, in allusion to Ex. ii. "What did he kill?" was the surprising retort. "A man? Is it not written: and he looked about him, and behold, there was *no man*?" A great part of the arguments from Scripture collected in Eisenmenger's work, I. Ch. 9, are no better than this. This art of the expositor, to twist and press the single words of the text in all directions, is praised with the epithet מְדַבֵּר (subtilis), as a peculiar art of the commentator. Examples of this kind are given in great number, yet without discrimination, in the compilations, much used by our commentators, of Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Eisenmenger and Wetstein;

passages from Targums of the second century, and from Prague Rabbis of the seventeenth, interpretations of law, and allegorical witticisms, by Rabbis from Arabic schools of philosophy, and utterly uncultivated Polish and Galician Rabbis, are thrown together in motley confusion. It will be seen, at once, that a comparison of New Testament usage with the illustrations preserved in these collections, must be made with more careful discrimination than has been common. See my dissertation "*de ortu Cabbalae*," 1837. In regard to the mode of interpretation, and still more with respect to spirit and taste, distinction must be made according to the times of the expositors, and the sphere and species of the exposition.

In respect to this latter, it is to be remarked, at the outset, that not precisely the same style of interpretation is appropriate to the juristic legal exposition and the dogmatic and practical, in the Halacha and Haggada. By Halacha is to be understood the authorized legal decision; by Haggada, the moral practical applications, the historical confirmations and illustrations.¹ Received customs, which had been introduced in the course of time, must be proved accordant with the Scriptures; this was the aim of the Halacha. It had, e. g., become customary to read the passage, Deut. 6: 4—9, together with 11: 13—21 and Num. 15: 37—41, twice a day; in the Scriptures this is not required. The attempt was made, however, to justify it from Scripture; it is said in the Mishna of Berachoth, "the Schammaites teach: in the evening the passage shall be read in a lying posture, in the morning, standing, for it is written, Deut. 6: 7, 'when thou liest down and when thou risest up.'" Hillel draws an inference from this passage only in respect to the time, holding that it contains nothing concerning the posture. Sometimes practice was directly in conflict with the Scriptures. In the Scriptures it is said: "Ye shall kindle no fire in your dwellings on the Sabbath." This, however, was done; the greater, therefore, was the need of reconciliation. There were, then, discussions among the teachers of the law, and according to the weight of authority or the number of voices a decision was made; this was the Halacha. "The precepts attached to Scripture and conceived in its spirit originally formed the Halacha" (Frankel's *Vorstudien zur LXX.*,

¹ הלכה from הלך, according to the lexicon, Baal Aruch, "a prescription according to which the Israelites walk." הנהגה from הגה, "the narration, explanation."

1841, p. 180). According to Geiger's investigations (as above, p. 67, cf. 244) in regard to מִשְׁנָה, in the Mishna the distinction is not yet made between מִשְׁנָה (simple sense), דְּרָשׁ (secondary sense);¹ דְּרָשׁ, in the Mishna, means only "explain." The exposition of the Mishna aims, then, merely at giving the literal sense, and even the Gemara repeatedly lays down the proposition אין מִקְרָא יוֹצֵא מִיֵּד מִשְׁנָתוֹ; Scripture does not pass beyond the literal sense (Jebamoth, f. 24, 1. Schabbath, f. 63, 1). Only by way of exception, when the practice fixed by tradition found no warrant in the natural sense of the words, does this interpretation resort to such artifice and violence as we have alluded to. Here, also, in such a case it is allowed that letters be transposed, that the text be read with other vowels, and that the arrangement of words be altered. Certain limits are, however, set to these caprices. Exchange of letters is permitted only at the beginning or end of words, not in the middle; further, the words to be exchanged must stand not too far apart. Again, a definite distinction is made between proofs from Scripture, רְאִיָּה, and mere supports, מְכַמְסֵת (Wähner's Antiqu. Hebr. 346. 372, Geiger, as above, p. 72); some teachers reject the latter class, others, certain modes of indirect proof from Scripture (Geiger, p. 72, note). Even in the Gemara, objection is still made to too violent treatment of Scripture; thus Rabba once, in opposing a Rabbi who went too far in the transposition of words, said in reproof: "A sharp knife does certainly cut up the verses" (Baba Bathra, f. 111, 2).

Far above all other books of the Bible, in the esteem of the Hebrew, stood the Thora; the others might be sold to procure a Thora with the money; the Pentateuch might be laid upon the other books; the reverse could not be. The exposition of the law must, therefore, be more exact with the words; even Philo will not sacrifice the literal sense of the words of the law. It is then conceivable that, where the interpretation of the law was not involved, greater license was allowed. The interpretation of the Halacha could come only from legal authority, and had reference to general religious duties; that of the Haggada served for personal edification and instruction, and might be given by any private individual.² "The exposition of the Hala-

¹ Thus, or by "subordinate sense," is this word more exactly translated, than, as is usually done, by "Allegory."

² Hirschfeld (I. 13) seeks, therefore, to press upon the word רְאִיָּה the signification, "opinion."

cha aims to point out in the Bible any special law that in life is esteemed biblical, guards, however, against the perversion of other passages by an interpretation consistent with this; it therefore defines laws of interpretation. The exposition of the Haggada, on the other hand, occupied with ideas, moves more freely; proof is not so necessary in the Haggada" (Hirschfeld, II 7). When Zunz compares the relation between the Halacha and Haggada, with that between the prophet and the priest, it must be said that the dissimilarity is greater than the resemblance. The Haggada, then, which has nothing to do with the law, avails itself for its ends not merely of the explanation of the words; as it falls entirely within the province of subjective application, it makes the freest use of the license mentioned in connection with the Halacha, and employs also the Midrasch in the narrower sense, allegorical explanation. An exhibition of the unbounded freedom allowed, is given by Wähner, *Antiqu. Hebr.*, 306, Hirschfeld, II. 353 seq. But for this very reason the principle is explicitly laid down, *בְּצֵל הַדִּינָה טָעִינוּ לֹא מִזְכָּר וְלֹא מִתִּיר*, "the Haggadist (Döpke translates incorrectly "Allegorist") can neither bind nor loose" (Cod. Horajoth, f. 48, 3). Zunz, in his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden*, 1832, p. 327, says: "But this freedom aimed neither at corrupting the Scriptures, nor at robbing them of their natural sense, for the purpose for which it was indulged was only free thought, not binding commandment. The greater the license allowed to the Haggada, in its treatment of the sacred books, the less could be conceded to the word of the individual; therefore, the Haggada has no binding authority either in interpretation or in practice."

But, in respect to the liberty thus authorized, a distinction is to be made in periods. Hirschfeld says (II 212): "In the earlier period of the exposition of the Haggada, these methods were applied more severely; in the later, when men had become accustomed to them, more wantonly." To have exhibited the progress of this license is a special merit of Geiger's treatise. The Mischna is followed by the Thosifta (additions to the Mischna) and the Boraitha (Mischna lying beyond the range of the proper Mischna). As appeal to these was not so decisive as to the preceding (Wähner, as above, 307, 311), we should expect to find here yet greater degeneracy in interpretation, which, however, is not the case. These books, which are to be found copied in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, distinguish between proper proof and

mere allusion, *וְזָכַר* and *וְזָכָר* (see proof in Geiger, 243); in the main they give a sharp grammatical exposition, although here and there the above mentioned arts of interpretation are practised, such as exchange of letters, e. g. Sifri on Lev. 1: 10. This characteristic cannot surprise us, if Zunz is right in maintaining that the books of the Boraitha are older than the proper Mischna (as above, p. 46). The authority of the Gemara is much less; in it the interpretation of the *וְזָכַר* occurs with the simple literal exposition. If, now, in these different collections of Talmudic tradition there is a progressive arbitrariness of interpretation, and if it is, therefore, to be assumed that the authors of the New Testament stand nearer the elder, simpler and more natural mode of procedure, it will be at once seen, how cautious one should be in treating expositions after the style and taste of the later Rabbis as parallel with the New Testament method.

When we now come to the question, whether Rabbinic citations with *וְזָכַר* and *וְזָכָר* always permit us to assume that the author regards the sense which he assigns to the citation as the original and primary sense, we should be obliged to confine ourselves, according to the remark just made, to citations in the Mischna; but, as we shall not readily be allowed to limit ourselves to these literary productions, which in point of time are nearest to the Apostles, we will, in what follows, refer to the Rabbis generally. Now that the Rabbis always and in all circumstances quoted in the consciousness of employing only the proper sense of the passages of the Old Testament, we must decidedly deny; and first, on the ground of general analogy. It follows, from the nature of the case, that the words of prominent writers should be employed by their admirers as substratum and verification of their own ideas, indeed, even as predictions of later events. In the first use, one seeks in an important authority a confirmation of his own thoughts, unless it be a mere play of wit; subsequent use rests upon this truth, that every profound utterance is realized, not once, but many times, in the course of history; that, in fact, there is nothing new under the sun. In this sense, the Greeks were wont to cite passages from their poets, especially Homer, à propos; Plutarch, *Symposiaca*, IX. 1, collects a number of illustrations, in which extracts from the poets are applied thus pertinently to the matter in hand. The later occurrence being regarded as, in a sense, a mere copy of the earlier deed or dictum, it is conceivable that, in such a case, even a pre-

It would be mere partisan prejudice to refuse to recognize solely among Jewish authors a custom which prevails everywhere else. This custom is especially natural in connection with sacred books, into the spirit of which the soul has so penetrated, that present events and ideas involuntarily suggest some familiar expression of Scripture; and this so much the more, if, as with the Jews, education is almost entirely restricted to the sacred codex. This is also the origin of the custom of weaving biblical phraseology immediately into the text, a custom that differs only in form from that of introducing by *קִטְרוֹת*, as is very common with the Jews. "To find everywhere biblical phrases given with verbal accuracy, must seem to readers a great advantage, partly because they have in this the best evidence that the author is well grounded in the Bible, and partly because this is the surest guaranty of his harmony with the Bible" (Duke's *Rabbinische Blumenlese*, 1844, p. 35). Sachs expresses the same idea (*Jüdische Poesie in Spanien*, 1846, p. 161): "So long as the popular consciousness is complete and independent; so long as it lives shut up in a world of views and conceptions of its own, which surround and envelop it as its atmosphere; so long as it continues productive in the same style and spirit that characterized the old intellectual works which first revealed its peculiarities; so long it seeks and finds in these works only a reproduction of itself; renews in them its own life, and recognizes them as bearing the valid impress of its own modified, enriched and deeply excited spirit." Accordingly, even Döpke, whose whole aim is to exhibit the perverseness of the Jewish style of exegesis, as rising even to absurdity, is obliged to admit, that sometimes, at least, in the application of Old Testament passages to later events, prophecy was not assumed (as above, 157); and, although the admission is made so reluctantly, that it seems to be retracted, p. 159, yet he finally abides by it. He himself gives a confirmation of it, when he mentions the fourfold sense recognized by the Rabbis, which they expressed concisely in the abbreviation *סֵדֶר, פֶּסֶק, סוּד, דָּרָשׁ, רְמֵז*, and defines it thus: (1) the literal sense, (2) the *ὑπόνοια* certainly intended by God, (3) the allegory possibly intended by God, (4) the arbitrary application. The conception and definition of these *termini*

tive, and obscure quotation from Hamann, which could hardly be made intelligible without copious explanation, and is not at all essential.

technici belongs, it is true, to the author's subjective view,¹ yet it shows that even he recognizes a province within which the Jewish author remained conscious that the application of the text was purely subjective. We must, however, after what has been said, go still further. The expositions of the Haggada, to which those of the Midrasch in the narrower sense, the allegorical, belong, have no binding authority as law; and, therefore, the influence of the subjective view must be recognized also in them. In the exposition of the law no figurative explanations at all were allowed. "In three instances has R. Ishmael explained the Thora *בגלגל*, i. e. improperly, yet the Haggada agrees with him in only two of them" (Hirschfeld, as above, I. 143). We can readily see how little disposition there was to allow to the allegorical interpretation objective authority. In respect particularly to the quotation with *פןאמר*, the formula *כבר עזיר*, "perhaps he here says," points distinctly to the subjective nature of the application. We are further pointed to a mere application of the text by passages where, for the sake of the practical moral truths in the style of the Haggada, the language of the text, as in Eph. 4: 8 (and two examples to be quoted directly show this), is first made pertinent to the end by exchange with words of like sound; and, in respect to this, Maimonides remarks (*More Nebochim*, III. 43), that this can be regarded only as a pleasant enigmatical play, to make a truth more impressive. Many expressions are, furthermore, of such a sort that only a determined prejudice could deny the obvious propriety of understanding them in this way. Such are the following, which Döpke, it is true, cites as examples proving that a hidden sense of words of the Old Testament is assumed by the author. Midrasch Thillim, f. 3, c. 1: He will be like a tree planted by the rivers of water; that is, Abraham, whom God took and transplanted into the land of Israel. In Tr. Joma, f. 38, c. 1, it is said, the family Garun has always eaten clean bread, as stands recorded, *והיה ימים*, Num. 32: 22, words from the

¹ The Rabbis did not themselves define these ideas so, and this classification was purely individual. True, it is mentioned in the Gemara, Tr. Chagiga, but is found more definitely in the Commentary on the Pentateuch, by Bechai ben Asher, about 1290. The word *סוד* denotes frequently (Schüttgen on Eph. 5: 32) the Cabbalistic exposition. *פירוש* is said by Fürst (*Bibl. Jud.* 1849, I. 75) to be the rational interpretation. *פירוש* is used of every application of Scripture, e. g. by Abarbanel in *פירוש חזקוני*, ed. Hulsas, p. 522.

passage in which command is given to the Reubenites and Gadites to aid their brethren in the conquest of Canaan, for then they would be clean (guiltless). Tr. Berachoth, f. 10, c. 2, R. Jose says: "Of him who eats and drinks before offering his morning prayer," is it written in 1 Kings 14: 9, "thou hast cast me behind thy back." Thou must read, however, not *אַחֲרֵי גִבְעִי*, but *גִּבְעִי נָא*, behind thy pride. Tr. Kilaim Jerush. f. 32, c. 2, it is said: "R. Judah had a toothache for thirteen years, and during this whole time no woman in Israel miscarried, *שָׁנָאֲמַר*, Isa. liii., 'verily he bore our sickness and took upon himself our pains.'" We add two other examples from a portion of the Talmud, to which, above all others, a sober practical discretion is ascribed, from Pirke Aboth, c. 3, § 22. The question is asked, to what he is to be compared whose ideas are greater than his deeds, and the answer is, to a tree with many branches, but few roots; when a storm comes it is torn up and thrown prostrate. By a *שָׁנָאֲמַר* reference is then made to Jer. 17: 6. To the question, to what he is to be compared whose deeds are better than his understanding, the answer is, to a tree with few branches but many roots; all the storms in the world could not move it from its place. Again follows with a *שָׁנָאֲמַר*, Jer. 17: 8. Ch. 6, § 2, it is said: "he who does not devote himself to the Thora is culpable," after which Ex. 32: 16 is cited with an *אֲמַר*: "the tables are God's tables, and the writing God's writing graven upon the tables. Read not, however, it is said, *חֵירוּת* but *חֵרִיּוֹת*, freedom; for none is free but he who busies himself with the Thora. Lo, he will be exalted, as it is said, Num. 21: 19, from Mathana to Nachaiel, and from Nachaiel to Bamoth, i. e. "from the gift, that is, the Thora, to God's possession, and from there to exaltation." The practical spirit of this portion of the Talmud leaves no room for doubt that this language, far from designing to exhibit the sense of the text, intended merely an application of it. If, in the examples above cited, the ambiguous formula *שָׁנָאֲמַר* or *שָׁנָאֲמַר* should leave the matter uncertain, then another passage with less doubtful formulas, in Halichoth Olam, ed. Bashuysen, Vol. I. § 3, may be compared: "R. Juda united with others to draw up the code of law; this was not accomplished until the Jews had peace under Antonine, *וְהָיָה זֶה מְקָרָא שְׁמֵחָא בְּיָדָא דְּיְהוֹנָתָן*, i. e. in this they rested on the word of Scripture: Now is it time to bring sacrifice to the Lord."

The consciousness of a subjective construction of such paral-

els from Scripture we can in any case regard only as relative. The more significant the coincidence of the earlier expression or fact with a later one, so much the stronger must we regard the inclination to discern in it a Divine intention, and, therefore, a prophetic element in the language of the Bible. Thus is a religious consciousness, that has not been scientifically developed, wont to recognize in one event of life a special Divine interposition, in another not, according to the relative degree of significance. We find even in a philosopher of antiquity the inclination to regard the correspondence of a poet's language with an important fact, as a divinely intended prediction. In the work *de fortuna Alexandri*, c. 10, Plutarch records, that Alexander, of all Homer's verses was most fond of this: "Both a good king and a valiant combatant in war," and adds, that it really appears as though Homer in that verse had not only celebrated the valor of Agamemnon, but predicted that of Alexander: ὅς τ' εἶπεν Ὅμηρον, ὅτι τῷ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ τὴν μὲν Ἀγαμέμνονος ἀνδραγαθίαν κακόσμης, τὴν δ' Ἀλεξάνδρου μεμάντανται. If here, even to a philosophically cultivated man, the line of distinction between objective and subjective parallels disappears, between the sense put into a passage quoted and that drawn from it, how much more must we expect this by Jewish authors. Sachs accordingly (as above) says: "The word that had come down from the past was not to stand apart from the present, strange and indifferent as a thing of history that had passed away forever. The life of the present was, therefore, infused into the letter of the past, and it can hardly be determined, in this peculiar mode of treating the word of Scripture, whether more was derived from the given form, or more put into it." As a question of dogmatics, this theory of divinely intended parallels will be examined in § 5.

§ 3. *Application of the Old Testament in the Discourses of Christ.*

Former discussions have comprehended Christ and the Apostles, without discrimination in this particular. But, as a difference in degree distinguishes the hermeneutical method of Paul from that of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, so does Christ's use of the Old Testament rise above Paul's application of it.

If we bring together the different quotations of the Old Testa-

ment in the discourses of the Redeemer, the interpreter of the nineteenth century will in many ways detect the profoundest insight into the spirit of the older Scriptures, will never prove one exposition false, nor discover in a single passage a trace of Rabbinical artifice. The interpreter, free from dogmatic prejudice, will at least recognize the originality and the religious profoundness of a great soul standing far above his times. Only one application of the Old Testament has, and not without reason, made the impression of Rabbinic subtlety. This we bring forward first, in order to test by it the truth of the proposition which has been laid down. It is the proof of the resurrection given to the Sadducees, Matt. 22: 32. This mode of proof, it is said, involves Rabbinical hair-splitting dialectics, and is, further, not original, but borrowed from Rabbinic predecessors; so the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist, in Lessing's Contrib. (4, 434 seq.), who regards this "faded, Cabbalistic" exposition as evidence that the doctrine of immortality, which had been derived from other nations, could not be proved at all from the Old Testament. Cf. Döpke (p. 55), Strauss, Hase. The argumentation would be a quibbling, quite in Rabbinic taste, if, as some assume, e. g. Zuingli, Calov, Macknight, the weight of proof lay upon the Pres. *εἰμί*, particularly as neither the Hebrew text, nor Mark, nor Luke has this. Clericus, Grotius, and Bengel, long ago declared themselves decidedly opposed to this construction, and the latter refer properly to Heb. 11: 16, as a parallel which suggests Christ's meaning here. That God could not put himself into such intimate relations with men, could not call himself their God if they were mere transient existences, is the great fundamental idea (Neander's Life of Christ, Ed. 3, p. 603), which is brought forward in Heb. xi., probably with reference to this passage in the Gospels, and may be expanded thus: the relation to God in which man finds himself in time, is the condition of the consciousness of his eternal relation to God. On this truth all philosophical proofs of immortality rest (see Erdmann in Br. Bauer's Zeitschr. für die Specul. Theol., I. 213 seq.). In so far, therefore, there is given by Moses an intimation (*ἐμψυχον*, Luke 20: 37) of the resurrection. When Christ, as confirmation, adds, that God was not the God of the dead, there lies in this only a profoundly suggestive allusion to the law, by which the dead (corruption) pollutes; according to this analogy, he with whom God enters into so close relations, must be a victor over death,

a living being. If we now compare with this language, so full of import, the parallels gathered by Wetstein and Scheid (addimenta to Meuschen's N. T. e Talm. illustrata) from the Rabbis, to whom Jesus is said to be indebted for his words, is there one of these that makes the remotest approach to it? Even Dr. Paulus remarks: "how entirely Jesus's train of thought on this topic also surpassed the notions common in his nation, in his pure sense for the simple and essential, deserves to be shown by a comparison with the argument of the Rabbis for the continuance of the life of the departed." There is only one Rabbinic passage that strictly corresponds with this, the oft-quoted passage from Manasseh ben Israel de resurrectione mortuorum, 1836.¹ But how is it with this passage? It is expressly adduced by Manasseh, not among the proofs furnished by the ancients, which he collects in Vol. I. Ch. 1, but among his own, which he gives in Ch. 10 seq.; and, that this learned Dutch Rabbi, who in this work quotes also Plato, Plutarch and others, should in the *recte infertur* have had Christ in mind, can hardly be doubted. Another evidence how it is with many Rabbinic parallels to the New Testament!

Where reference is made in Christ's discourses to direct prophecies, this always finds a justification from the point of view of modern historical exegesis. The chief passage is Matt. 22: 43, although Matt. 26: 21, Luke 4: 18, 22: 37, may be classed with this. In Matt. 22: 43, Christ by the *ἐν προφηταῖς* declares Psalm cx. to be a really prophetic, inspired utterance. That it can, in a typical sense, be called Messianic, is not disputed. "The Psalm utters for the theocratic king the promise of a high priestly dignity and authority combined with the kingly; which promise had not been realized in the person of him whom the poet had immediately in his eye, nor in any of his earthly successors, but was to find its deepest fulfilment first in Christ" (Bleek, Comm. on Hebr., II. 186). He, however, who regards the prophecy as typical, holds an ideally depicted king of Israel to be its object, and, therefore, can no longer regard the $\frac{1}{2}$ of the superscription as the $\frac{1}{2}$ auctoris. But this Christ does; his conception of the Psalm must, therefore, be the directly Messianic.

¹ L. I. c. 10. § 6: cum Mosi primum appareret, Dominus dixisse legitur: Ego sum Deus patrum tuorum, Abrahami, Isaaci, Jacobi. Atqui Deus non est Deus mortuorum, quia mortui non sunt, sed vivorum quod vivi existunt. Itaque patriarchas etiamnum respectu animae vivere ex eo recte infertur.

If one holds, as most recent commentators do, the direct Messianic construction, and also the superscription of the Psalm as incorrect, then Christ explained the Psalm falsely in its historical bearings; unless one will with Neander (*Life of Christ*, ed. 3, 607), assume an *argumentatio ex concessis*, in which case the *in verum* must be set to the account of the Evangelist, and not to that of Christ himself. It is understood that the principal motive of those who reject the superscription altogether, or, contrary to all analogy, regard the $\frac{1}{2}$ as designating the subject of the Psalm, has been the dogmatic assumption which cannot allow such a Messianic prophecy in the Psalms. If, under a different view of prophecy in general and of that in the Psalms in particular, this motive is taken away, there is nothing besides that should make the direct Messianic conception inadmissible (cf. Hengstenberg on this passage); and it has been admitted by commentators who are not dogmatically prejudiced, such as Köster, Umbreit, von Lengerke. In respect to the prophetic passages quoted in Matt. 26: 31, Luke 4: 18, 22: 37, they in themselves favor the assumption that they are mere parallels, a substratum for Christ's own thoughts. Yet, when Christ, Luke 4: 18, opens to the prophecy in Isa. lxi., and declares that these words are today come into fulfilment before them, we are less at liberty to think of mere parallelizing, than of an indirect Messianic prophecy; Christ intends to designate the substance of the passage as prophetic, now in his appearance come to its fulfilment. With reference to Isa. liii., the most various authorities agree in this, whatever may still be thought of the subject of the passage, in recognizing there a presage of facts of the New Testament; cf. Gesenius on this passage, and Vatke (*Bibl. Theol.*, I. 531): "The contemplation of the sufferings and the glorification of the servant of Jehovah forms the most remarkable presentiment of redemption in the Old Testament, and is thus prophecy (not prediction) of Christ." And this indirect prophecy becomes direct under that exposition, according to which the prophet in 42: 49 "describes Israel in its totality according to its design, but in ch. liii. views the ideal Israel as an individual" (see Oehler "On the Servant of God," in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.*, 1840, No. 2, and Umbreit, "The Servant of God," 1840, whose view is, however, rather wavering, and Sack's *Apologetik*, second edition, pp. 321, 328 seq.). The citation in Matt. 26: 31, from Zech. 13: 7, is also a mere simile, according to Calvin and Drusius, who

understand by the shepherd the aggregate of the rulers of the people. Yet it can hardly be doubted that the shepherd is rather here, as often before, a representative of God (Hengstenberg's Christology, II 332).

Christ's interpretation of Matt. 24: 16, seems most questionable of all, in case the expression from Daniel was regarded by him as a direct prophecy. According to most commentators this is so; see Hävernicks and Hengstenberg on Dan. 9: 26, 27. Olshausen on Matt. 24: 16. Stier's Discourses of Jesus, II 546. Now, most weighty arguments may be adduced against the genuineness of Daniel, so that even Olshausen places the book in the same rank with second Peter. Yet the question can by no means be considered decided; cf. especially Hävernicks treatise, which has been too little regarded, "New critical investigations regarding the Book of Daniel," 1838. The fact urged by Sack (Apologetik, second edition, 333 seq.) is further indisputable, that this controversy grows out of a view of prophecy in general that is by no means established. Were the book written *post eventum*, then the passage to which Christ appeals would relate, not to a future, but to a past event, the desecration of the temple under Epiphanes. If we now assume this to be correct, would Christ's view of the passage be proved erroneous? We really cannot see, what forbids the assumption that Christ here, as in Mark 9: 14, where Hengstenberg, as we shall presently see, concedes this, refers to an actual parallel in the past, which is here significantly repeated. Cf. Redepenning's review of Hengstenberg's Authenticity of Daniel, Stud. and Krit., 1833, No. 3, p. 868. There are, furthermore, among the advocates of the genuineness of Daniel, those who, as Hoffmann lately does, refer the passage in Daniel to the desecration of the temple under Epiphanes.

The treatment of the Old Testament as typical is much more common with the Redeemer than is generally supposed. He regards the Old Testament, with its institutions, in its history, and in its single expressions, predominantly as typical. Precisely this organic typical mode of viewing the Old Testament, according to which modern theology, from different points of view, is ready to recognize a prophetic element in the structure of the Old Testament, is demonstrably that of the Redeemer. It is especially evident in the Gospel of John; and this fact has not been hitherto heeded. According to the context, we must, by the testimony of the Scriptures mentioned in John 5: 40, under-

stand, if not exclusively, yet chiefly, the whole spirit of the Old Testament, which, received into the heart of man, produces there prophetic longings for Christ; so in v. 46 (cf. my Comm. on these passages, and Baumgarten-Crusius on v. 46). From such a view as this of the character of Messianic prophecy as a whole, we are to explain general allusions to the prophets, like John 5: 46, 7: 38. John 3: 14 refers expressly to the prophetic nature of a type, and the institution of the Lord's Supper is connected with the meal commemorative of the typical deliverance from Egypt. Christ's expression in regard to John the Baptist is peculiarly suggestive in this particular, according to Mark 9: 13: ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι καὶ Ἠλίας ἐλήλυθε, καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα θελεῖσαν, καὶ ὁὕτως γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν. We observe, first, that Christ seized upon the expression, Mal 4: 3, according to its idea, and, therefore, found the Elias there promised, ideally, in John the Baptist; the εἰ θελεῖτε δεῖξασθαι, which is not yet adequately explained, seems designed to indicate distinctly that the fulfilment of the prophecy was properly not to be sought at all in an individual; if they would, they might, however, see it in John. But if it is there further declared that the violent conduct of men towards this John stands also recorded in the Scriptures, in what other than a typical sense can this be said? Hengstenberg speaks thus of the exact correspondence of the type with the antitype (Christology, III. 477): "Whatever opposition Elias encountered is so much the more to be regarded as a real prophecy of the experience of John the Baptist, in proportion as both come nearer the idea (of a preacher of repentance). Is John like Elias in the solemnity of his call to repentance, so must he be like him in suffering and persecution. Divine Providence so ordered it that the inherent, essential similarity was stamped, also, on the external form of their experience; that in Herod, Ahab, in Herodias, Jezebel appeared again." An exact parallel to this typical exposition of Christ is given by the Jewish Christian Hegesippus, in Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., II. 23. As has been remarked above, after recording the death of James, known as ὁ δίκαιος, he adds: thus has the word of Scripture, Isa. 3: 10, come into fulfilment: ἄρωμεν τὸν δίκαιον.

If Christ, to so great an extent, treats the Old Testament type as prophecy, it can no longer surprise us, if he often, especially with reference to his suffering and glory, refers to the whole Old Testament as prophecy of himself; Matt. 26: 24, 54, 56.

Luke 24: 27, 44. John 17: 12. When we observe how he, in expressions whose historical authenticity is undisputed, holds up the persecution and reward of the prophets, as a type, before his disciples as representatives of the same principle, Matt. 5: 12; how he regards the activity of his disciples in opposing the spirit of this world, as a continuation of the experience of the prophets, Matt. 23: 34, 35. Luke 11: 47, 48; and then in numerous instances predicts for his disciples, as defenders of their Master's principles, their Master's fate, the assumption seems surely warranted, that he in like manner regarded, as preëminently fulfilled in himself, whatever stands written of the suffering and victorious prophet and saint of the Old Testament. This contest of the Divine principle with the principle of the world, successful even in overthrow, he treats as the law of the Divine constitution of the world, and this seems to him embodied in the types of Scripture; cf. *κατὰ τὸ ὁρισμένον*, Luke 22: 22, with *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*, Matt. 26: 54. This parallelism must be especially obvious to him, the son of David and spiritual head of the kingdom of Israel, with reference to the head of the kingdom of God glorified through suffering, to David. From this point of view, we find an explanation for citations like John 13: 18. 15: 25. Matt. 27: 46. Luke 22: 37, which refer to the Old Testament in specific realizations of that law.

"That there are types in nature and history, follows from the general relation of *becoming* to *being*, of *history* to *spirit*." The type is not the image thrown back by a mirror into the past from the future as God intends it, but the future germinating in the past, as in nature every lower organic stage prefigures the higher, and the sports of the child, the activity of the man. But the truth of typical parallels is especially conspicuous, when, from the external emblematic stage of an historical sphere, an inward spiritual development of this organism proceeds, as the Christian kingdom of God from the Jewish; here the principle, apart from all the presuppositions of Christian dogmatics, must be recognized as finding a profound justification. According to the remarkable language of 1 Pet. 1: 11, it was the spirit of Christ already working beforehand in the prophets, that prophesied in them of Christ. De Wette (in his "Beitrag zur Charakteristik des Hebraismus," in the Studien of Daub and Creuzer, III. 244) says: "Already, long before the appearing of Christ, was the world in which he was to appear made ready; the whole Old

Testament is one great prophecy, one great type of him who was to come and is come. Who can deny that the holy seers had long beforehand seen in spirit the coming of Christ, and in prophetic presage more clearly or obscurely comprehended the doctrine? And this typological comparison of the Old Testament with the New was no mere idle play. It is, further, hardly pure accident that the evangelical history in the most important particulars runs parallel with the Mosaic." In so far as this mode of exposition rests on a view of history which sees only the spirit which reveals itself in the different stages of history in even greater intensity—the law of history—it may, with Beck, be called the *pneumatic*, and was, even in the ancient church, so called. Syrian typologists use for typical the expression $\Delta\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon\pi\omicron\varsigma$ (Wiseman's *Horae Syriacae*, I. 55); the $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\iota\varsigma$ and the $\piνευματικ\acute{o}\varsigma$ of the Scriptures are equivalent expressions (Baur's *Gnosis*, p. 88); and in the Apocalypse, so rich in profound typology, it is said, 11: 8, that Jerusalem is $\piνευματικ\acute{o}\varsigma$ called Egypt; namely, as antitype of that power so despotic towards God's people, as Babylon is type of the heathen secular power.

As Christ on the most various occasions has always ready the most pertinent, morally discriminating answers from the Old Testament, we must, at the outset, assume, that the common popular use of Old Testament expressions as substratum for one's own thoughts, will also occur in his discourses. The passages of the Old Testament found in the history of the temptation, as used by him, Deut. 8: 3. Ps. 91: 11. Deut. 6: 16, 13, can be classed here. They give, as it were, the motto for the series of ideas which the Redeemer opposes to the successive temptations. To this class belong, also, Matt. 13: 14, 15. 21: 13, 16, 42, 44. If the appeal to Ps. cxviii. in Matt. 21: 42, be said to denote a proper prophecy, this would be an erroneous exposition of the Psalm, the subject of which Hengstenberg also (*Psalms*, IV. 1, p. 307) regards, not the Messiah, but the spiritual Israel destined to dominion in the world; so does even Stier, according to the historical sense, although he holds to a threefold prophetic sense running parallel to this. But is it not intended by the formula of quotation here and in v. 16, $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\delta\epsilon\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega\tau\epsilon$, to indicate merely, that, if they had read the Old Testament passage with reflection, they must also have drawn a conclusion with reference to the event before them?

We find, therefore, among all the instances in which the Old Testament is cited by the Redeemer, not one that can give occasion to the charge of Rabbinic artificial or historically erroneous exposition.

§ 4. *The Application of the Old Testament by Paul.*

The citations of the Old Testament by this Apostle have lately been criticized by several commentators, and, in some instances, with a decided partisan prejudice. While Rückert, assuming that Paul, as a general rule, in his citations, believes himself to be adducing prophecies, judges thus: "How it stands with the proofs of the Apostle from the Old Testament, we know well," and yet is considerate enough, at least in some instances (e. g. 1 Cor. 1: 19. Rom. 10: 6 seq., 18), to let the quotations pass as mere parallels, "that he might give his own thoughts a Biblical coloring;" Meyer, and still more decidedly, Fritzsche, attempts with iron consistency to prove in every instance a prophecy, i. e. as so regarded by the author, and thus encounter Calov's argument in controversy with Grotius.

Let us, then, show first, how unfounded is this consistency, running as it does into absurdity. The mere clothing of one's own thoughts in the consecrated words of Scripture should, in the first place, not have been mistaken, where the Apostle, as is uniformly the custom in the Apocalypse, incorporates in his own discourse as essential elements, expressions from the Old Testament parallel to the given fact of the New, as Rom. 10: 13, 18. 1 Cor. 15: 25 (cf. Rückert and Meyer on this passage). Eph. 4: 31. For he has in like manner woven immediately into his discourse admonitory and dogmatic sentences, as in Rom. 3: 4 (from Ps. 116: 11), Eph. 4: 26. There is but one exception, in 1 Cor. 15: 27, where *ὁ τας δὲ εἰναι* characterizes as prophetic the words introduced into his own discourse; but it is in all probability to be said here, that Paul has only clothed in words from the Old Testament the expression of his own faith, and merely in his subsequent argumentation treated this as prophecy. We are further to recognize mere accommodation in those passages in which the Apostle must modify the words of the text to make them pertinent to the case before him, as Rom. 10: 7, 8. Eph. 4: 8. 1 Cor. 2: 9. Had it been the Apostle's intention to adduce such expressions as prophecies for proof, would not his aim have

been at once frustrated, if arbitrary adaptation of the language could be proved against him? It will be replied: but was not such artifice demonstrably accepted in Jewish hermeneutics as allowable? Certainly, in the Haggada; and it is to just this department that these citations by Paul belong, i. e. *not to the department of strict proof*, but of free ascetic application.¹ Finally, in some places the mode of introduction shows that the Apostle did not think of prophecy. When in 2 Cor. viii. he is admonishing the church to bring about a certain equality by giving one to another, in v. 15 he refers to Ex. 16: 18, where the text in historical narration reads: *ὁ τὸ πλεὺν οὐκ ἐπέλασσε καὶ ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον οὐκ ἡλαττόμενος*; the same case occurs in 9: 9, in adducing Ps. 112: 9. Again, in Paul's discourse, Acts 13: 40, the subjective character of the citation is indicated by the formula: *βλέπετε μὴ ἐπιλθῇ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τὸ εἰρημέρον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις*. In like manner, the formula used in another passage in Acts, points to the natural import of a citation from the Old Testament which occurs frequently in the New, in the interpretation of which modern rationalistic exposition indicates no less a lack of sound common sense than the old Rabbinical. Isa. 6: 9, 10 is in the New Testament several times applied to different persons. According to Fritzsche and Meyer this is always as prophecy. Matt. 13: 14, Christ is said, according to Fritzsche, to have seen in this passage of the Old Testament a prophecy of the intellectual stupidity of the Jews in regard to his parables.² According to Meyer, in John 12: 40, John refers the prophecy to a judicial act of Christ himself (not of God!) by which he had blinded his contemporaries with regard to himself. Paul, in Rom. 11: 8, as Fritzsche will have it, applies the expression to the Jews of his time (*ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας*). The question whether such a conflict in interpretation between Christ and his apostles, and of these among

¹ As evidence to the contrary, reference might, indeed, be made to Matt. 27: 9, where the Evangelist introduces the prophet's words with a formula of citation as prophecy, and yet conforms the words to the fulfilment. Yet we are not certain how much of the form in these citations belongs to the Greek translator. Further, the case is quite different from that in Eph. 4: 8. Rom. 10: 7, 8. There is here no violence at all done to the text; only the interpretation is combined with the quotation.

² Fritzsche on Matt. 13: 14: interpretatio: iterum accidit Jesaiae tempore ipsi illa Wetstenio probata, quum tollit naturam verbi ἀναπληροῦσθαι, tum Jesu consilio repugnat, qui Jesaiae locum pro vaticinio tractat, quod per suos aequales ratum fiat.

themselves, was to be admitted, would not have embarrassed these commentators. The answer would have been: this inconsistency, as it appears to our interpretation, is none from the Jewish point of view, which admits a plurality of senses in the words of Scripture. Acts 28: 25, however, points to the natural, unartificial conception of the matter, where this language from Isa. vi. is introduced with the words: *καλῶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησε διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν*. Now if Paul thought that, in all these passages, he was citing prophecies, he must have quoted altogether without regard to sense and connection, according to a merely accidental similarity in the language. This is contradicted by the fact, that, when the LXX., which he commonly follows, departs too far from the meaning of a text, he is wont to go back to the Hebrew text, just as Matthew or his translator does in Messianic passages (Koppe, in the Excursus to the Epistle to the Romans, Credner's Contrib. to Intro. to the New Testament, II.).

Besides the Pauline citations already mentioned, the following also belong to the class of mere accommodations, Rom. 2: 24. 3: 4, 10—18. 8: 36. 9: 13, 15, 33. 10: 11. 15: 3, 21. 1 Cor. 1: 19, 31. 3: 19, 20. 14: 21. 15: 54, 55 (in like manner if v. 55 is not reckoned with the citation). 2 Cor. 4: 13. 6: 2, 16—18. Gal. 4: 27.

In regard to the historical correctness of Paul's exposition, it cannot be denied, that he often derives more from a passage than is according to the historical sense contained in it, yet always with an accurate and profound conception of the fundamental idea. Thus, in the interpretation of the blessing of Abraham, Gal. 3: 8; in the argumentation in Rom. 4: 11, which he rests upon the circumstance that Abraham received circumcision as a seal of faith; in the argument in Rom. 4: 17, based on the expression "father of many nations;" in the proof of the calling of the heathen, Rom. 9: 25, 26, from passages which refer to Israel as become idolatrous; Acts 13: 35 seq., in the direct Messianic interpretation of Ps. xvi.;¹ Rom. 9: 33, in the direct reference of the stone of stumbling, Isa. 28: 16, to Christ, although it

¹ Whether *τῆς* is correctly translated by *δια-θῶν* is here of minor importance; the point is rather, whether the Psalmist used it in this sense. This Hengstenberg gives up, and attempts, on the contrary, to show that Peter, also, in the corresponding application of the passage, Acts ii., had in view only the signification *grave*. Further, Ewald's exposition, also, recognizes the ideal nature of the Psalmist's hope, reaching, as it does, beyond the range of the Old Testament.

more properly denotes the ideal theocracy established in Israel, and so elsewhere. These expressions are never seized upon arbitrarily, according to a mere apparent analogy; only their original sense is in the application restricted or extended. The Apostle proceeds like one, who, having seen a completed picture, and then cast a glance upon the outline sketch, believes that he sees more indicated there, than he who is familiar only with the sketch. If we may bring forward for comparison recent analogies, we would allude to the development of ancient philosophical systems by modern philosophers, according to their several points of view, as Platonism is represented, e. g. by Tennemann and by Hegel; or to Schweizer's exhibition of the earlier Reformed theology, in regard to which a reviewer says: "Without exactly altering the Reformed theory, the author brings to view, in its dark beginnings, a much higher development, and thus anticipates what belongs first to the theology of the Union."

By commentators who do not value formal correctness above truth to the idea, the same deep spiritual discernment has been recognized in Paul's expositions as in those of Christ. It has been hidden only to the pedants of the schools. A distinction will be found to exist only in this, that, with the disciple, this deep discernment prevails through the medium of the culture of the Jewish schools, while, with the master, *γράμματα μὴ ματαθηνώς* (John 7: 15), this is not so. With Christ, furthermore, regard to what is universal in humanity, is predominant, while, in the Apostle's application of the Old Testament, as well as in his dialectics, the Rabbinical school betrays itself; this medium exercises upon the form of Paul's exposition a determining influence, while it has not been able to pervert its spirit. Many have expressed a more unfavorable judgment, having particular regard to Gal. 3: 16. 4: 24 seq. 1 Cor. 9: 9, 10. 10: 5. It is said that here, at the expense of truth, Rabbinic culture has manifested itself in arbitrary allegorizing, in pressing the letter to the neglect of grammar, in the adoption of absurd legends. More thorough examination shows these accusations to be groundless.

The Apostle reasons in Gal. 4: 24, through an allegory, which he himself calls such: *αἰνὰ ἵστιν ἀλληγορούμενα*, i. e. which is of such a kind that it has another than the proper signification; Hesychius: *ἄλλο τι παρὰ τὸ ἀκονόμενον ἀποδεικνύουσα*. We have a remark to make, first, concerning the use of the word *allegory*. Mynster expresses the strange idea (on the author of the Epistle

to the Hebrews, Stud. and Krit. 1829, II. 334), that in the New Testament there is nothing at all of allegorizing; in Gal. iv. and in Hebrews "only a slight approach to it." The author is thinking, however, of the allegory in Philo's style, which gives up altogether the literal sense where it is objectionable, and where not, declares it nonessential (Dähne, Alexan. Religionsphilos., I. 63, 64). This style of allegory is unknown even to the Palestine Midrasch, much more, to the New Testament. Allegory in the New Testament, as Paul here employs it, is nothing but the *typical* sense; and the propriety of typical exposition cannot be denied here. In the relations of the descendants of Sarah and those of Hagar, the relations of the children, of the legal and the evangelical institutions, are shadowed forth. The children of Sarah are like the latter, for they are born *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, i. e. according to a promise, through Divine interposition in behalf of the dead Sarah, and are free, being born of a free woman; the children of Hagar are like those under the law, for they are born *κατὰ σάρκα*, i. e. in the course of nature (cf. *κατὰ σάρκα*, Rom. 4: 1), and of a slave. Paul had also distinguished in like manner in Rom. iv. a twofold posterity of Abraham, that of the children of faith, and those after the flesh, in v. 12. But, according to some, the typical exposition is here in fault (De Wette on this passage, Baur's Apostle Paul, p. 667), for it was Ishmael that had nothing to do with the law, while the descendants of Isaac were rather subject to the law. But an allegory, in the technical sense, a *sustained* analogy, we do not find here, but simply a *type*, which by no means requires correspondence in all points, as Rom. 5: 14 shows. There arises now the further inquiry: but did not Paul look upon this type as objective, designed by God? It certainly seems so.

The consciousness of the objective nature of the *τύποις* appears more decidedly with the Apostle in the citation, 1 Cor. 9: 9, 10. Here, even De Wette allows himself to be led into the error of assuming an allegory in Philo's sense, to the exclusion of the literal meaning; and if *πάροις* were to be explained with Meyer "altogether," then Paul would have definitely made prominent the exclusion of the literal sense. But how would even a Rabbi have dared to deny in terms the literal import of the law, Deut. 25: 4? Even Philo speaks only with displeasure of those who, for the sake of an allegory, dare to abrogate laws of Moses (see the well-known passage, de migratione Abr. p. 401,

Dähne's Alex. Religionsphil., I. 66. Gfrörer's Philo., I. 86, second edition). Especially, how could a disciple of him, according to whose word not a sparrow falls to the ground without the Father in heaven, expressly exclude beasts from the number of the objects of Divine providence? The same Rückert who says "we know well how it stands with the Apostle's proofs from Scripture," does not hesitate, as sound common sense requires, in the question *μή τῶν βοῶν μᾶλλον τῶ θεῷ*, to supply *μέρος* after *βοῶν*. He who regards the first epistle to Timothy as Paul's, has a decisive argument for the literal sense of the commandment in 1 Tim. 5: 18. We are then, with Billroth, Rückert, Lachmann, to consider all as far as *λέγει* a question, and explain *σάρκες*, as is common in answers, as an emphatic affirmation: doth God care for the oxen alone, or doth he say this certainly for our sakes? This "certainly," "by all means," presupposes the literal sense, and aims to show, notwithstanding, that it was also said for the sake of the apostles; in other words, that the application to the apostles is one intended by God.

We shall come back to discuss in § 5 the Divine intention in such expressions, but will first look at the legendary (so called) interpretation in 1 Cor. 10: 4. Following Semler, recent commentators, Rückert, Meyer, De Wette, say that the Apostle followed the Jewish legend, according to which the fountain springing from the rock attended the Israelites forty years long, and that he saw in this rock Christ's Shekinah. We will not here enter into other grounds, lying in the text itself, limiting ourselves to this remark, that the existence of such a legend is still unproved. The oldest passages adduced by Wetstein and Schöttgen, are from the Targums, and these all speak, not of the water from the rock, but of quite another thing, of the fountain raised from the earth by the staves of the princes and Moses, Num. 21: 18. Authors of later date allude only to this fountain. Only one *dictum* seems to include the rock with this, viz. in a passage from Jarchi in the commentary to the section of the Talmud, Thaanit, f. 19. 1, it is said: "Miriam's fountain (with whose healing, legend puts the fountain in connection) was the rock from which the waters flowed. In his exposition of Num. xxi., however, where he speaks at length of the matter, he follows exactly the form of the legend given above, and in ch. xx., where the rock is spoken of, adds nothing that could be applied here.

Concerning Gal. 3: 16, where the Apostle, in order to be able to prove a prophecy, is said to have done violence to grammar, see the Supplement.¹

† 5. Application of the Old Testament by the Evangelists.

As *ἀγγέλλουσι* the Evangelists have nothing of the subtlety that marks Paul's use of the Old Testament, and, furthermore, their applications of it fail to exhibit always Paul's profound discernment; parallelisms which rest so little on an internal connection of ideas, as Matt. 2: 16, 23. 8: 17. 13: 35. John 18: 9, are not to be found in Paul.

The assumption of mere adaptation to the words of the Old Testament, may seem more doubtful here, where, instead of the formula *καθὼς γέγραπται*, we usually find *ὡς ἀληθεύει* (with the exception of John 12: 14). True, it is not for that reason necessarily excluded, as appears from the fact that *προφητεύειν*, which,

¹ [Of this long and elaborate discussion we can give only an abstract. To prepare the way for a just and generous estimate of the Apostle's argument, the author examines Acts 17: 23, 28. 1 Cor. 11: 16, as showing how profound and sagacious is the Apostle's interpretation of nature, and of heathenism. Can he err so greatly or reason so frivolously as many assume in regard to Gal. 3: 16? He is said to have falsely applied the collective *σπλ* in the promise to Abraham, to one individual, Christ, and to prove this, urged the singular form *σπλ* as applicable only to an individual, while in fact it is used in innumerable instances collectively, and the plural occurs only in another sense. If the Apostle reasoned so, he knew better, and accommodated his argument to his readers, who, he might assume, were stupid enough to accept it; or he, so long trained by Gamaliel, knew no better! Now the only logical and proper sense of *σπλματα* is different species or classes of descendants, posterities. The promises, involving ultimately participation in the kingdom of Christ, were not given to the *σπλματα*, but to the *σπλμα*; to the *σπλμα*, since a promise made of them, that the heathen should be blessed in them, is a promise to them. But who or what is this *σπλμα*? We should think of Christ, and Paul says *ὅς ἐστι Χριστός*. And yet the promise is *τῷ σπλματι*. And, again, if the Messiah is the *σπλμα*, what is the reasoning? The question was, whether those who should become partakers of the kingdom only through faith, without the law, were genuine partakers? Verses 9, 19, 29, and Rom. iv. show that the *σπλμα* cannot be exclusively the Messiah, but the spiritual posterity of Abraham, as distinguished from his posterity in every other sense. And this posterity is Christ. He is *κατ' ἔξοχον*, the Son of God, and believers are, in the full sense of the word, sons, one with Christ, and, so far forth, in faith, and as believers, Abraham's seed and heirs. They are one person (*εἷς*, v. 28) in Christ, his *πλήρωμα* (Eph.), cf. 1 Cor. 12: 12. The promise had, then, from the first, a definite spiritual posterity in view. — Tr.]

as we have seen, is used of a mere simile, is an expression equivalent to *πληροῦσθαι*. A simile occurs in Matt. 2: 18, where, however, it is not the intended fulfilment that is made prominent by a *ἵνα πληρωθῇ*, but only the fact of a fulfilment, expressed by *τότε ἐπληρώθη*. In those cases, on the contrary, in which, by *ἵνα* or *ὅπως πληρωθῇ*, the occurrence of a fulfilment is represented as the result of a Divine intention, it is most probable that some sort of objective connection of the fact with the expression of the Old Testament is supposed, a direct prophecy or a *ἐπύκνωση*. Thus in Matt. 1: 22. 2: 15, 32. 4: 14. 8: 17. 12: 18—21. 13: 35. 21: 4. 27: 9, 35. John 12: 15, 38—40. 19: 24. Now, where the Evangelist saw in passages of the Old Testament a prophecy, where a typical parallel, we can, as may be supposed, not always determine with certainty. In Matt. 1: 22, the unique character of the New Testament fact, and the *παρθένος* of the LXX, go to show that the Evangelist cites Isa. 7: 14 as a proper prophecy. The correctness of this conception of the passage is, however, not yet satisfactorily established from the context, which, it must be admitted, has not been explained in a way altogether decisive. The most thorough Messianic exposition, after Hengstenberg, is that of Drechsler (*Expos. of Isaiah*, 1844, Part 1). Yet this commentator does not conceal the fact, that the Messianic interpretation can be reconciled with vs. 15, 16 in the prophet only by a violent process, that which is seen independently of time (?), being confusedly mingled with the events whose time is defined. Ingenious, indeed, but more artificial, is the explanation given by Hoffmann (*Prophecy and Fulfilment*, 221; see on the other side Umbreit, *Stud. and Krit.* 1845, II.). Ewald, it is true, asserts confidently, "that explanation is likewise false, which does not observe that the prophet is here speaking of him who is to be Messiah," but assumes that the discourse treats of no supernatural conception, and that the prophet expected the birth and growing up of the Messiah within his own lifetime. Into the question which is usually discussed at length, whether *παρθένος* can mean only an intact virgin (see Drechsler, and especially Kleinert in the *Litt. Anzeiger*, 1832, Nos. 25, 26), there is less need of entering; the point is, whether the prophet finds the *παρ* in this, that she is to conceive supernaturally, and so far forth remain a virgin. If this is not the prophet's sense, then Matthew could not cite the expression even as a complete simile, and the typical parallel is limited to the name Immanuel.

Of proper prophecy, direct or typical, the Evangelist is thinking, furthermore, in Matt. 4: 14. 21: 4. 27: 9, 35. John 12: 15, 38—40. 19: 24, 37. In Matt. 21: 4. John 12: 15, a direct prophecy is generally conceded by modern exegesis; on Matt. 4: 14, cf. Umbreit on Isa. 8: 23. Ps. xxii. (Matt. 27: 35. John 19: 24) is, on account of its wonderful conclusion, v. 28 seq., a Messianic Psalm, if regarded merely in a historical light. What the singer, impelled by the Spirit of God, says of his sufferings and their fruit, has found its perfect truth only in Christ. As to the citations from Zechariah in Matt. 27: 9. John 19: 37, cf. Rev. 1: 7, exegesis must wait for yet more light upon this peculiarly important and obscure prophet; still, essential service has been rendered by Hengstenberg, and we cannot doubt that this prophet, who in chapters iii. and vi. has so undeniably proved his supernatural discernment as seer, in those passages also prophesied of the Messiah. The citation, John 12: 38, 39, we should be inclined to regard as a mere accommodation, did not v. 41 show in what way the Evangelist justified to himself the direct reference to the Messiah. The Logos, God as revealing himself, was also to the prophets the medium of revelation; consequently there also the prophet (it should properly be said God) had in view in that language the demeanor of obdurate Israel towards Christ; an exegetical inference whose correctness certainly must be denied, while yet this is perfectly true, that that Divine accusation, which represented the spiritual stupidity of the people as an universal characteristic, first found its most complete confirmation, in the conduct of the nation towards Christ. Here, again, then, we see truth in finite limits; incorrectness of form with truthfulness of the idea.

That these Evangelists with the formula *ἡ αἰχμαλωσία* certainly did adduce, not merely direct prophecy, but types of the future assumed to be divinely intended, may be clearly proved in the following manner. If the Evangelist in John 18: 9, sees a fulfilment of Christ's words in 17: 12, he can have done this only on the supposition of a *ἐσθλεία*; for, that the Redeemer by *ἀπώλεια* intended a spiritual destruction, the Evangelist could not have failed to perceive for the very reason that Judas is made an exception. It might even seem doubtful, whether he assumes an intended *ἐσθλεία*, and would not merely make prominent the remarkable fact of a fulfilment of Christ's words in the physical deliverance of the disciples; yet we have a similar case in John

11: 51, where, on account of the remarkable realization of the high priest's words in a higher sense than he humanly intended, a Divine *ἐνόημα* is still assumed in the utterance of them. Among these typical parallels, Matt. 2: 15. 8: 17 also belong. Here the citation seems purely arbitrary, inasmuch as, in the former passage, no true parallelism between the calling of Israel out of Egypt and that of the Messiah seems demonstrable; in the latter, for the ethical sense of the prophet's language a physical sense is substituted. If, however, we may suppose in the Evangelist the idea, which has its warrant also in Isa. 49: 3, that the Messiah, as the absolute son and servant of God, had his type in Israel, might not this circumstance seem remarkable to him, having his Jewish readers in view, that this Son of God was also obliged to depart into Egypt; quite independently of regard to the different purpose of the departure? In respect to Matt. 8: 17, it is just as little to be assumed as in John xviii., that the Evangelist insisted upon the physical construction, to the exclusion of the moral; it seemed to him remarkable; he regarded it perhaps as designed, that the words should be fulfilled, also, in this sense; whether we are to suppose him prompted by the consciousness of the connection between sin and evil, as Olshausen holds, remaining an open question. One instance is yet to be mentioned, Matt. 2: 23, that *crux interpretum*, where the unlearned Evangelist seems to have employed the mystical quibbling of the Haggada, and to have found a prophetic intimation in the sound of the words. According to Meyer and De Wette, he finds something prophetic in this, that the predicate צִיץ, "sprout," given to the Messiah in Isa. 11: 1, forms a paronomasia with צֶמֶח. But the Evangelist writes in the plural, διὰ τῶν σπογγίων, and the interpreters above named recognize the ground of this in the fact, that he has reference as well to other passages where the Messiah is called צֶמֶח. Zech. 6: 12, "and behold a man" who is called צֶמֶח. It is, therefore, even doubtful whether *ἐν* is a relative, and whether we have not rather to translate "that he shall be called a Nazarene" (Gersdorf's "Sprachchar. des N. T." I. 136). The Evangelist had, then, regard not merely to the sound but to the sense of the word. Now Nazareth had its very name, נָצְרָת, from the fact that it was "a feeble twig," an insignificant place, and there was special contempt for it (Hengstenberg's Christology, II. 1 seq.). The thought of the Evangelist is, therefore, "in the fact that Jesus chose the despised place; there was

at the same time a fulfilment of the prophecy that he was to be a humble sprout from David's stem." There is a truth in this, only it seems to us a contracted religious view that seeks in such accidentals a Divine intention.

This brings us now to the question already touched upon, how it is with regard to this Divine intention in the types and parallels of the Old Testament, which is assumed by the Evangelists, and also by Paul, and probably by Christ. And first, we remark, that in some passages a consciousness opposed to this, that of the subjective character of such parallels, is expressed. When Paul in 1 Cor. 10: 6 writes *ταῦτα τύποι ἡμῶν ἐπηρεάζουσιν*, De Wette admits that *τύπος* is here only "token;" we are to take warning from them when we draw a parallel. In Rom. 5: 14, also, *τύπος* may be only the type which to the view of the Apostle lies in the fact, not that designedly established as such by God. In Eph. 5: 32, by *ἐν τῷ δὲ λόγῳ αὐτῷ Χριστὸς* he expresses a consciousness of the subjective nature of his application. In Rom. 15: 3, he gives his own thought, that Christ had for God's sake suffered reproach, in his own words; when he justifies this by the remark, that all that is recorded in the Old Testament can serve for our *διδασκαλία*, he gives a general canon for the subjective use of Old Testament parallels. In other instances, like Gal. 4: 24. 1 Cor. 9: 9, 10. John 11: 51. 18: 9. Matt. 2: 15, 23. 8: 17. 13: 35, etc., this is certainly not the case, and these demand a dogmatic investigation into the Apostle's mode of reasoning. The natural mode of viewing things calls every coincidence of events and actions, which is brought about neither by an inward necessity nor by a free intention, *accident*. A man is struck down upon the road; a priest passes by; Christ says it occurred *κατὰ συντυχίαν* (by a *happening* together). Ruth goes out to glean; the field upon which she happens, belongs to Boaz; an *accident* (τυπὴ, a meeting) would have it so. What is accident according to *natural* principles, is according to those of religion "a monarch by the grace of God, whose incognito we must respect." And with right. For, must not just this connection of events, this concurrence and with this the reciprocal influence, be referred to the highest causality, that rules the world? "The accidents," says Novalis, "are the separate facts; the concurrence of these accidents, their coincidence, is not again an accident, but law, the result of the profoundest, most systematic wisdom." And Rothe says (*Ethik*, I 124): "How entirely

soever the several results may be, each by itself, the effects of the freedom of the creature, their aggregate result is the effect of their combination and concentration, and this, which we are wont to call accident, is alone God's work, the work of his government of the world. What appears to us accident, is just that kind of occurrence in the world which we are compelled to refer exclusively and directly to God's government of the world as its cause, inasmuch as we are unable to discover within the realm of creation an adequate causality." By Moses, the Son of God, the people of Israel, is led from Egypt; by the parents of Jesus, Jesus the Divine child; neither by human intention, nor by internal necessity, has this parallelism been brought about; its ultimate ground is in causal agency of God ruling the world. Caiaphas will let Jesus die for the good of the nation; Jesus dies, according to his own decision, in a higher sense for the good of the people; Caiaphas did not intend what Jesus does, nor does Jesus design to make true what Caiaphas says; it is the Divine causality, by which these facts, standing in no internal connection, are made to coincide. In referring such coincidence to a Divine influence, this religious view of the world cannot be pronounced erroneous; only that it commonly, and also in the citations of the apostles, follows a *particularistic* method, namely, in proportion to the importance of certain occurrences to the highest ends in the universe, or even merely for a subjective interest, *this* coincidence is distinguished above that in other cases, and designated as the special ordering of Providence, while the objective view refers every coincidence to Providence. As no individual thing can be conceived and willed by the highest causality as individual, but each only as a member in a universe, in which each is conditioned by all, and is again the condition of all, so a privileged participation in Providence cannot be maintained. The contrary seems to be involved in Matt. 10: 29—31, but the conclusion serves only to confirm the subjective confidence of man, that he, in consideration of the higher end assigned him, may more certainly regard himself as the object of Providence, than beasts.

So far modern speculation may go hand in hand with that of the New Testament. Only the types of the Old Testament are regarded as unintentionally fixed, these earlier expressions, which were realized in later occurrences, as uttered without special intention. The view of the New Testament, on the contrary,

finds here, for the most part, Divine intention, and in language a divinely intended *ἰνόρροια*. The modern theological view stops with considering the efficient cause; the biblical stands on the ground (predominantly, at least, see above) of a regard to the final cause. With this it is as with all pragmatic teleology. The mutual fitness which we ascribe to the several data in nature and history, is never the only one (for all conditions all), often not the most immediate one, i. e. the immanent, sometimes even a purely subjective one which does not at all exist in them. This subjective character the teleology of the evangelists exhibits, when, in order to be able to assume a Divine intention, they presuppose a *ἰνόρροια*, which has no connection with the historical sense, indeed, even contradicts it, as in John 18: 9. 11: 51. Matt. 8: 17. This is just as we should say, that those edifying feelings that are derived from the Scriptures, through an alteration of the historical sense of Scripture, cannot be regarded as a result intended by the author of Scripture, even though they may ever be subjectively profitable. Typology receives, therefore, from Augustine the warning: *est conjectura mentis humanae, quae aliquando ad verum pervenit, aliquando fallitur*. Where, however, a historical sphere is developed from a lower, as is the case in the New Testament economy, in such a way that the same laws spiritualized reappear in it, and leave their impress in its institutions, rules of life, expressions, the typological and parallelizing application will gain an objective character, and may be regarded as divinely intended.

† 6. *Application of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

This Epistle has a writer for its author who shows himself not less versed in the Old Testament, and uses it not less frequently than Paul. But the defects in hermeneutics, which were striking in Paul and the evangelists, appear in this Epistle in a yet higher degree. While Paul's citations correspond, at least in idea, with the expressions of the Old Testament which are adduced, those in our Epistle seem in part, as in 1: 6, 10—12. 2: 13, to be altogether without warrant. The way in which the author applies the Old Testament for the end of his argument, is yet less to be pronounced free from subtlety (cf. the exposition of Ps. xcv. in 3: 7—4: 9, and the pressing of the letter of Ps. cx. in ch. vii), and his application still less grounded upon objective

truth than that of Paul, since he does not, like Paul, in case of important differences between the Greek translation and the Hebrew text, go back to the latter, but argues from the LXX. even where they translate incorrectly, as in 2: 7. 10: 5. By some critics the difference in the use of the Old Testament is esteemed so considerable, that it has been expressly employed to prove the origin of the Epistle not Pauline. "No one will be able," says Schulz, *Epis. to the Hebr.*, pp. 180 seq., "to show anything like this in the genuine Epistles of Paul; and the few passages where he also exhibits typically single points from the books of the old economy, and allegorizes, which we see brought up against us by the defenders of the Epistle (Gal. 4: 22—30. Eph. 5: 31), will by no means suffice, even should they not, on closer examination, be converted into proofs to the contrary."

Before we examine in detail the style of exposition in this Epistle, we ask, whether its peculiarity distinguishes it specifically from Paul's method. That, in expressions like that quoted from Schulz, the difference is rated too high, is admitted on various sides, by Böhme, Bleek, von Cölln,¹ and recently by Schwegler; and yet to some extent these same men have held the designated peculiarity of our Epistle as so singular, that they were disposed to trace it, not merely in general to the Alexandrian culture of the author, but to an immediate influence of Philo. As formerly by Grotius, Clericus, Mangey, so there was by Bleek, I. 389 seq., and most recently by Schwegler (*Nachapost. Zeitalter*, II. 314) a direct use of Philo assumed. An affinity in the substance of the doctrine we cannot concede; and in this agree with Neander² (*Planting and Training*, II. 857 seq., fourth edition). But in what the so often assumed relationship between the mode of exposition in our Epistle and Philo consists, has been indicated neither by Bleek, nor by De Wette (*Intro. to the N. T.*, 290, fourth edition), nor by others. We must maintain that just those specific points of relationship are wanting, the philosophically figurative conception of the import

¹ In the review of Böhme's Commentary in the *Halle Litt. Zeit.*, 1826, No. 131: "On the contrary, it is quite to be commended that Böhme declares against the opinion of those who, from the Epistle and the allegorizing, conclude, without further ceremony, that the Epistle was written by an Alexandrian Christian."

² The significant fact, that by our author nothing at all is said of the *λόγος*, the idea predominant with Philo, Schwegler knows how to explain only from a definite intention, because "the author was conscious of the novelty of this mode of teaching."

of words, the appeal to the *καίρες τῆς ἀλλήγορίας*, the extension of allegory to the physical department, and especially the equivalence or the subordination of the historical sense to the mystical. As proof to the contrary in the last particular, 5: 12—6: 3 has been adduced, yet this has been disputed as well by Bleek as De Wette. Following Dähne and Gfrörer, the Tübingen school indeed goes so far as to suppose allegory with the Jewish theosophy in general to have proceeded from Alexandria, and especially from Philo into Palestine. This view has, however, so little claim to truth, that the most weighty facts indicate the contrary. We call attention only to the following, that Philo himself supports his explanations by an allegorical tradition (Dähne, I 69, 74), the division into physical and ethical allegory, quite in accordance with the so characteristic Midrasch of Palestine, the *מקשה בן-קיה* and *מקשה מן-כנה*, and the intermixture of Jewish Haggadae even in the LXX. (Frankel, *Vorstudien zur LXX.*, 1841, 186 seq.).¹

True, our Epistle has an Alexandrian coloring, distinguishing it from the Pauline, as well in the *genus dicendi* as especially in the use of the Old Testament, only it is not peculiarly Philo's method of interpretation. While the literary character of Paul is the Talmudic-dialectic, that of our Epistle is the Hellenistic-rhetorical. As the homiletic-rhetorical use of the Bible is always less severely exact, and often, especially in early times, lacks a clear consciousness of the relation of the sense put into the Scriptures from that drawn from them (see above Sachs's language), so with our author, upon whom, furthermore, in all probability, the greater arbitrariness in interpretation prevalent at Alexandria also had an influence. This distinguishes him from Paul.

The influence of the homiletic character of the Epistle upon the citations, we perceive in the very first chapter. From the beginning the author designated the Son as the summit of all revelation, as the heir of all, as the Creator of the world, and the image of God. From this results his superiority to the angels, in which connection reference is made to passages where he is called Son of God, which is said of no angels; where he is

¹ However thoroughly Georgii "die neuesten Auffassungen der Alex. Religionsphil." in the Journal for Historical Theology, 1839, has in other respects illustrated Philo's allegorical exposition, what is said of its relation to that of Palestine is very unsatisfactory. The author supports himself only upon Eichhorn and one passage in Jost's History of the Israelites, where besides the Masorah is the subject.

called God, Creator, Ruler, at the right hand of God; while, on the other hand, it is said of the angels, that they were to worship him, that they were servants of God. Subsequently, 2: 6 seq. shows that the earthly humiliation of Christ has not impaired his exalted dignity. Four of the citations used require, even in a historical exposition, a recognition of their Messianic character. In the direct Messianic conception of Ps. ii. and cx. expositors of the most diverse dogmatic schools coincide, Hengstenberg, Sack, Stier, Rosenmüller, Küster, Umbreit, von Lengerke, while others, like Bleek, maintain at least the typically Messianic import. A judgment on the words adduced in 1: 5 from 2 Sam. 7: 14 may be more doubtful. The promise of the building of the temple, in v. 18, we can apply only to Solomon, and thus agree with Bleek, in opposition to Sack. On the other hand, Sack is right, as Bleek also admits, in this, that the expression refers to the whole posterity of the king, and that the promise of an eternal kingdom presupposes the Messiah. What the first half of v. 14 specially promises, and the author here cites, has been verified in other descendants of David in a subordinate sense, preëminently in Christ's relation to God. The question, whether there is anything Messianic in that promise, depends essentially on the view taken of the last song of David, 2 Sam. 23: 1 seq. Undeniably a Messianic hope is expressed in this song; by Ewald, who translates v. 3 as conditional and refers it to David, this prospect is reduced to the most perfect possible minimum, to a posterity ideally described (*History of Israel*, II. 671): "Once more before his death, rousing himself to a poetic strain, David clearly feels himself to be a prophet of Jahve, and proclaims, in review of his now completed life, as well as in free survey of the future, the Divine presentiment in him, that the dominion of his house, being firmly established in God, will survive his death." It is, however, very questionable, whether, as Maurer, De Wette and others understand and translate the expression, the one ideal ruler of David's house is not depicted; if this be so, then the song points back to former promises, and to what other than 2 Sam. vii.? So, then, David also referred the promises given to his posterity preëminently to the Messiah. The enigmatically concise and highly poetic character of this remarkable song speaks for its genuineness; it is also acknowledged by Thenius on this passage, and Ewald (*Dichter des A. B.*, I. 99). Ps. xlv., which is cited in v. 8, can for decisive rea-

sons be regarded only as an allegorical Messianic song; cf. my exposition of the Psalms, Stier, Hengstenberg, Sack, recently also von Lengerke.

Most striking of all, however, are the appeals to Ps. 97: 7. 102: 26 in vs. 6, 10. On account of the application given to these Psalms in our Epistle, the majority of commentators, it is true, down to A. Cramer (1756) have regarded the Messiah as their subject (cf. the controversy of Calov with Grotius); yet Michaelis, in his exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, concedes, on v. 10: "I should say that it was inconceivable how expositors have been able to persuade themselves of this, had I not made a similar vain attempt in the 31st note to Peirce." At least, with reference to v. 6, this expedient was resorted to by Storr, that the author had, as in Rom. 10: 6—8, used the words of the Old Testament as a substratum for his own thoughts, "in order to express himself elegantly." Still, these expressions are used as *proofs*! De Wette speaks of a typical application of them (On the Symbolic typical method of the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 16): "The theocratic king and the Messiah are related to each other as image and original; again Jehovah and the Messiah as original and image, and what is true of one is true also of the other. Therefore, it is clear, that what is said of Jehovah, so far as he is the God of revelation and mediation, is true of the Messiah." If a typical exposition is to be thought of, the author must have recognized the primary reference of the Psalms to Jehovah; but is this probable, since he still uses them in his proof? We are, then, brought back to the conjecture, that, among the Jews, the Messiah was regarded as the subject of those two Psalms, and that the author could depend on the assent of his readers. But this has, from the outset, no probability, as it would hardly fall in with the dogmatic notions then prevalent concerning the Messiah. "Only from the idea of the incarnation of the λόγος," says Bleek, "could such a construction of the Psalm proceed."¹ It seems, then, that we must regard the

¹ It is, indeed, alleged by Grotius that the renowned Saadiah interpreted Ps. cii. of the Messiah; this seems, however, to be founded in error. From this accomplished, rationalizing Arabic interpreter, this might at least be expected, inasmuch as he does not even explain Ps. cx. of the Messiah, but (as some did in Chrysostom's time, see his Comm. on Ps. cx.) of Abraham; cf. the communication on Saadiah's translation of the Psalms, by Schnurrer, in Eichhorn's Bibl. III., and Haneberg on Saadiah's translation, as preserved in a MS. at Munich. 1841. p. 29.

Messianic application of those Psalms as the peculiar possession of our author, and this can be best explained from the rhetorical homiletic character of the Epistle. If the author could expect from his readers assent to the Christological propositions in vs. 2, 3, it followed that all passages in the Old Testament relating to the adoration of God and the creation, had their truth also in Christ, with reference to his Divine nature. This view of the passages in question seems to have suggested itself to Limborg, when he, on v. 6, lays stress on the fact, that the author had to do, not with unbelieving Jews, but Jews become believers.

Without regard to the historical sense, the author further cites Ps. 8: 6 in 2: 6. Ps. 22: 23 in 2: 12. Isa. 8: 17, 18 in 2: 13. Ps. 40: 7 seq. in 10: 5 seq. Hag. 2: 6 in 12: 26. That the author in 2: 6. 3: 15. 11: 13. 12: 26 applies the passages of the Old Testament homiletically, can hardly be disputed; in 10: 5 De Wette leaves it doubtful, whether he uses the words of the Psalm only as a substratum, as Schleiermacher also, in the sermon "The perfecting Sacrifice," on Heb. 10: 12 (seventh collection), says: "Our author starts with this, that he is citing, as referable to the appearing of the Redeemer in this world, words of the Old Testament which the Redeemer, as it were, must have spoken on his entrance into the world." But admitting this, we still cannot assume in the author a distinct consciousness of the relation of the sense put into the passage to that derived from it; if a text was pertinent for Christian application, he certainly found in the text itself a warrant for this, accordingly a Divine intention, as he in 11: 15, 16. 4: 8, seeks expressly to make out an objective justification for his explanations; the question, whether it was direct prophecy, whether typical, whether a mere subjective application, did not suggest itself for consideration; as little as with those Midraschists of old (see above). But if, in the passages mentioned above, he may have distinguished between his application and the proper sense of the passages, in others, which he, in like manner, cites without regard to the historical sense, no such discrimination can be thought of. In ch. ii. he seems to have conceived of Ps. 22: 23. Isa. 8: 17, 18, only as directly Messianic; not even merely typical, for the point is, that *Christ* calls the redeemed his brethren and children.¹ How full of significance every word of the text is to him, and, therefore, also even

¹ Paul would hardly, says Bleek, II. 380, have applied these passages in this way.

that which is not said in the text, 7: 6, shows. According to him, the text designedly omitted to give the genealogy of Melchisedek, that he might, in this respect, also, become a type of the Son of God (cf. the commentary on this passage). As the words of the Old Testament, so also the facts narrated in it, are to him full of import; even the names of Melchisedek and Salem are significant to him; the fact that the patriarchs dwelt only in tabernacles, he applies in ch. xi, as afterward the expression *strangers*; that the high priest went only once a year into the holy of holies, proves to him the absolute redemption once for all through Christ, 9: 7. 10: 10. Incidentally, these expositions by our author are to be distinguished from those of Paul also in this, that these bear more the character of the studied, the scholastic, while those show rather the free grasp of an original and profound spirit, just as our author, furthermore, seems always to have consulted the Greek translation which is uniformly cited literally, while Paul quotes from memory, now, according to the original, again, according to the LXX., as the instant suggests. But, if not an original and powerful, certainly a thoughtful and delicate spirit is discernible in our author's expositions of texts. How rich, notwithstanding all the subtlety of the argument, is the thought, that the invitation to God's rest, Ps. xcv., is properly an invitation to the rest which God himself enjoys since the end of the work of creation (ch. iv.)! So the explanation of the type in Melchisedek, ch. vii., of the holiest of all in the tabernacle, and the sacrifice of atonement in ch. ix., of the word *stranger* in 11: 13, and the application of Ps. xl. in 10: 5—9. How beautifully are many expressions of Scripture woven into the text, as 12: 5, 16. 13: 6, 15! The depth of these expositions is distinguished from Philo's theosophic acuteness by a practical religious interest.

By the universal use of the LXX., instead of the Hebrew text, the objective truthfulness of the interpretations has in some instances suffered more seriously than through the hermeneutical structure. This is not so fully true of 10: 6—9 (see the commentary), but of 2: 9. 10: 38. 11: 21. 12: 26. 14: 3. Yet his application of the Old Testament rests on the strictest view of inspiration, since passages where God is not the speaker, are cited as words of God, or of the Holy Ghost (1: 6, 7, 8. 4: 4, 7. 7: 21. 3: 7. 10: 15), so that the author seems to have shared in the conviction of the Alexandrians of the inspiration of their

translators. By Paul, on the other hand, as has been before remarked, the sense of the original is always given when the deviations from it are considerable, especially when such exist in the point for which he cites the passage (Bleek, II. 351).

If we, then, in conclusion, glance at the results derived from these investigations to the doctrines of inspiration and revelation, a view of inspiration according to which a universal accuracy is ascribed to the words of Scripture, cannot be maintained in accordance with these results; nor a theory of revelation, which assumes this of all the words of the apostles. Yet, what "God by his Spirit hath revealed to the apostles" (1 Cor. 2: 10), was not means of proof for their faith, but the substance of that faith itself. Paul emphatically scorns to convince by *λόγοι σοφίας*, and, in general, by any other *ἀπόδειξις* than the power of the Holy Ghost, involved in simple preaching (1 Cor. 2: 4, 5). The question arises, what he means by the *λόγοι σοφίας*. The most recent interpreters, disagreeing in regard to Christ's party, yet agree in this (having Acts 18: 24 in view), that the *ἀπόδειξις λόγων σοφίας*, which was despised by the Apostle, refers to the manner and argumentation of Apollos (Neander, Baur's Paulus, p. 323, Rübiger, Critical inquiries concerning the Epistles to the Corinthians, 1847, p. 89); if then, according to the present state of criticism, Apollos or an Alexandrian Christian like him is to be regarded author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, have we not in this Epistle a specimen of what Paul meant by the *σοφία ἀνθρώπων* in the Epistles to the Corinthians, and of which in founding the Corinthian church he would keep his preaching free? Can the Apostle have ascribed infallibility to these *λόγοι σοφίας*? And when he, in his own Epistles, uses here and there proofs from Scripture, arguments from nature and customs (1 Cor. 15: 36—38. 11: 14), would he have judged these from any other point of view than the human *γνώμη* (1 Cor. 7: 12, 25, 40)? But, though that which "God hath revealed by his Spirit to the apostles," is immediate substantial truth, is it not implied in 1 Cor. 13: 9—12 that this is none the less susceptible of formal development? As, therefore, even in the apostles' type of doctrine, as well peculiarity of constitution, endowment and cultivation as of religious profoundness manifests itself, so it is also in their argumentation and mode of proof from Scripture. We have found greater hermeneutical imperfection in the Evangelists than in Paul, and still greater in the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who is

not an Apostle. The Epistle of Barnabas, again, stands below the Epistle to the Hebrews. The want of taste, law and method in its expositions, as they occur in ch. 5—17, is one of the reasons, why the Epistle is denied to be from the apostolical comrade of Paul. That taste and method may be demanded of an apostolical man, must in *abstracto* certainly be denied after what has been said above; yet there are points in which a sound primitive Christian life does preclude a certain sort of want of taste. A Christian soul, filled with the sublimity of the objects of the Gospels, will be immediately touched by the impropriety of such expressions as occur in the Gospel of the Hebrews: of the rich young man, it is said, "he went away and scratched his head;" as words of Christ we read: "My mother, the Holy Spirit, seized me by one hair, and took me to the great Mount Tabor." Nowhere, with all their other literary imperfections, is there an expression like this in the Canonical Gospels. The practical sense of a primitive Christian, penetrated by the predominantly practical tendency of Scripture, will not readily be betrayed into digging out from it such mysteries as these in the Epistle of Barnabas, that the number (318) of the servants circumcised by Abraham, written in numerals, contains an intimation of Christ and his cross; that the prohibition to eat hyena's flesh allegorically forbids adultery and pederasty, because this animal yearly changes its sex, is now male, now female, etc. But should this be, it certainly is in direct contrast with the spirit of the genuine products of primitive Christianity, when the author takes credit to himself with reference to just such insipid applications, when he adds: "Never has any one heard from me a more uncorrupted truth; I know, furthermore, that ye are worthy of it" (ch. ix., cf. end of ch. x., xvii.). A sound Biblical Christian sense will, to a certain extent, set limits to hermeneutical irregularity. It will not stray into expositions which stand in contradiction to the universal character of the interpretations given in the New Testament; the *analogia fidei* will form itself in him as a guiding tact. With full right, then, is that sort of want of taste in hermeneutics which this Epistle exhibits, held to be evidence against its originating with an apostolical man, and it regarded as contemporary with the writings of Justin Martyr, whose typology often corresponds with that of our Epistle (see Hefele's notes in the *Opera Patrum Apostolicorum*). To see how wide the difference is in spirit and method of interpretation

between the Epistle to the Hebrews and that of Barnabas, consult the opinion even of a theologian like Eichhorn, in my commentary on the Epistle, p. 63. However Alexandrian culture may have made the author predisposed to a barren method of exegesis, he is by nature a profound, and through his faith a practical Christian man; by both he is kept back from an arbitrariness deficient both of ideas and taste.

The use of the Old Testament in the discourses of Christ, has in no point given offence through its hermeneutics; if the result of our inquiry is to be a judgment on the Redeemer's freedom from all error, though he should really have erred, room is left for maintaining his freedom from all error in the sphere of interpretation. But, if not independent of exegetical results, still such a judgment must rather develop itself dogmatically as a result of one's Christological views. Now at present the Christology of the orthodox church has unfolded the doctrine of Christ's humiliation in such a form (König, Thomasius, Schmieder) that nothing else is given in his appearance, his actual existence, than a pure humanity standing under the universal law of human development. If omniscience is given up, the question arises, where limits to knowledge cease; whether correct views in exegesis lie within or without these. Human knowledge is twofold in its nature; that which, under greater or less excitement from without, is developed purely within, in thought or intuition, and that which can only be humanly learned and stamped on the memory. If the Redeemer's development was that of universal humanity, then knowledge within the religious moral sphere, especially that needful to exegesis, which is only to be learned outright, can have been accessible and familiar to him only according to the state of culture in his age, and the means of culture in his education and intercourse. Proofs might be brought to show, that, even in questions pertaining to learned exegesis, such as those concerning the historical connection of a passage, the author and age of a book, an original spiritual discernment without the culture of the schools may often divine the truth; the highest degree of this divining power may be ascribed to the Redeemer, yet this can never supply the place of proper scientific study. The Redeemer did not come to reveal to the world science, even theological, but to teach humanity and exhibit to humanity religious moral truth. If, in the discourses of the Redeemer now extant, there may be no

formal hermeneutical error, the impossibility of this cannot be maintained beforehand, any more than of a grammatical fault, or a chronological inaccuracy. If the period of critical Rationalism subjected the earlier theology to an ordeal by which many general principles and assumptions were swept away, this gain should at least have been left us, a consciousness of the distinction between the Christian religious knowledge that belongs to humanity, and the Christian theological, that belongs to the schools.

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

I. SEPTEM CONTRA THEBAS.¹

It is with much pleasure that we welcome this excellent edition of the "Seven against Thebes" of Aeschylus. Filling, as it does, an important place in that series of specimens of Greek poetry, which has been begun by President Woolsey and Professor Felton, and which we hope to see as ably completed, it is a valuable contribution to our aids for the knowledge of classical antiquity. The plays of Aeschylus are the chief extant monuments by which we can represent to ourselves the transition from the epic to the dramatic poetry of the Greeks. They have been appropriately called "Lyrico-dramatic Spectacles." They combine, in a peculiar degree, epic description with lyrical expression of the feelings awakened by the scenes thus described, and dramatic portraiture of the characters and conflicting interests it presents; and the two former elements, the epic and lyric, when compared with the dramatic, form a much larger proportion than in the plays of Sophocles or Euripides.

The "Septem contra Thebas" is especially marked by these characteristics. The main events of the play are not represented, but narrated in heroic recitation. The approaching conflict and crisis are hardly *seen* at all. We are warned of them by hurrying messengers and the sound of distant

¹ Septem contra Thebas, a Tragedy of Aeschylus. Edited, with English Notes, for the use of Colleges, by Augustus Sachtleben, Principal of a Classical School in Charleston, S. C. Boston and Cambridge: James Munroe and Company. 1853. 12mo. pp. 156.

gathering tumult, and are told in words that stir us as with Homeric tones, who shall meet with whom; while, constant to their office, the choir of Theban maidens chant in alternate fear or grief, moaning, praying, dissuading, cheering; through all their long-drawn refrains still darkening the mind with solemn presages of the disastrous issue, the brooding curse of the race of Labdacus, fulfilled by the relentless Erinnyes. We can thus in this play, more clearly, perhaps, than in the previously edited ones, the Prometheus and the Agamemnon, trace the earlier growth of the classic drama; and we are thus far assisted to enter into Greek poetry as a gradually maturing fruit of the Greek mind and feeling, and better prepared to understand its successive productions as parts of a connected and beautiful whole. Let this play, for example, follow the Iliad in a collegiate course, and the resemblances between the two in subject and spirit, the retention of the old as well as the transition to new forms, will readily be seen. The student thus finds an added interest above that awakened by the drama itself; a pleasure the same with that he feels in tracing the organic growth and unity of the literature of his own language.

We are well aware, that such matters belong rather to the historian and critic than to the editor; nor do we know that any extended reference could be judiciously made to them in a work intended mainly for a text-book of language. But, in the absence of any generally accessible English works, historical or critical, on classical literature, we have sometimes wished our college editions of Greek authors might take larger liberty for this purpose. Coleridge's Introduction, had he lived to complete his plan, would have done much for an intelligent and tasteful appreciation of the Greek poets, as not mere *drill-books* in a dead language, but living parts of literature. Browne's and Anthon's compends (the latter of which, however, we have not seen), as well as Dr. Smith's recent History of Greece, will doubtless contribute not a little to this object.

To the student of theology, the plays of Aeschylus, like the Greek drama generally, form an instructive study. They are a grand and impressive series of illustrations in the department of natural religion. More than almost all other remains of ancient literature are they touched, here and there, with the broken, and sometimes discolored, rays of that primitive revelation, of which all natural religion has been justly considered the reflection. And, yet more remarkably darken through these dramas the shadows, that have spread over the race from the looming up of moral evil between it and that primeval light. In the gloomy legends of the Labdacidae of Thebes, from which the present play takes its subject, we have set forth, with almost terrific power, the great law of "hereditary dependance, which connects the sins of one generation, and often of one individual, by an indissoluble bond, with the fortunes of another;" by which the son bears the sin of the parent, the righteous perishes with the wicked. It is the echo still heard from Sinai: "Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation" (*αἰῶνα δ' ἐς τρίτον μένει*, v. 744); the solemn scenic

presentation of the Bible truth, that no man liveth or dieth to himself alone (vv. 597, 598, 602—608).

Alas! the fate
That mingles up the godless and the just
In one companionship!

The man
Who, being godly, with ungodly men
And hot-brained sailors mounts the bark,
He, when the god-detested crew goes down,
Shall with the guilty guiltless perish. When
One righteous man is common citizen
With godless and unhospitable men,
One god-sent scourge must smite the whole, one net
Snare bad and good.

(*Blaisie's Translation.*)

At the present time, when the study of classical literature is more than ever decried, one can hardly value too much whatever may serve to freshen and enlarge our knowledge of its best works, to connect the past with the present, the ancient with the modern, the Pagan with the Christian time, and show the common humanity, the great first truths that underlie both, by means of which, as an essential bond of union, the old world was prepared to receive the new revelations and the new life of the gospel. And it is not too much to say, that every well-edited classic, while it must of course give prominence to the forms and idioms of language, as well as the simple facts of history or mythology, will yet more or less serve these larger purposes of the student of literature and theological science, and will do its part in demonstrating how essential is classical study, both to general discipline and complete scientific culture.

Mr. Sachtleben's edition of the "Seven against Thebes" seems to us one of the best text-books that has come from the American press. The preface is very appropriate, and no more than sufficient to illustrate the subject of the play and its position in the cycle of Thebaic legends, as well as to prepare the student for its general tone and movement. The principles of annotation by which the editor professes to be guided, are excellent and carefully adhered to in his commentary. His notes are clear and full, and evidently aim to meet all real difficulties. In his use of other commentators he shows a cautious yet independent judgment, not leaving the reader in the lurch among them all, as is sometimes done, but briefly discussing their various opinions and then stating and justifying his own interpretation, which he often does with marked critical tact and good sense. The statement of grammatical, and especially of syntactical principles, are discriminating and exact, and the connection of thought, sometimes not easy to trace in the lyric passages of Aeschylus, is pointed out with praiseworthy care. We have been especially pleased with the explanation of classical allusions, and the citation of passages, whether parallel or generally illustra-

tive, and from modern as well as ancient writers (see on vv. 21, 45, 145, 663, etc.). Every teacher knows how much life this kind of comparison, when used with judgment, adds to what often seems to students, especially in the early stages of their course (and to some, no doubt, in all), only a *dead* language and a *dead* literature. The dramatic situations and scenic changes (for of plot there cannot be said to be any to be unfolded) are also noticed in their order, though we found ourselves sometimes wishing that they could be brought more fully and picturesquely before the eye, as Blaikie, for example, has done in his admirable translation, by his descriptive stage-directions and his divisions of the choral chants.

We find little occasion to qualify our general hearty commendation, except that we have here and there desired a fuller notice of rhetorical and "aesthetical" beauties (such, for example, as the adaptation of the measure to the sentiment, the peculiar arrangements of words for rhetorical effect, etc.); a reference to grammars more generally in use in our colleges, as Kühner (by Edwards and Taylor), Sophocles or Crosby, and a less frequent resort to the old expedient of supplying ellipses, where the language justifies itself, as it stands, and may even be supported by some analogous English idiom. We may add, also, that in our judgment the notes would be improved in excellence and utility, by a greater degree of elegance as well as of *etymological* exactness in the translations, thus combining both *literal* and *idiomatic* English, and we think that such a rendering will also be found to be the most vivid and poetic. It is true, that the first object of a commentary must be to give a clear and intelligible sense, and that this sometimes requires a bald literalness or a prosaic paraphrase, inconsistent with elegance; but this certainly is not always nor usually the case; and, even where a passage must be loosely spread out for the sake of clearness, it may be gathered up and condensed again, for the sake of poetic truth and spirit. There is so constant a tendency to careless and awkward translation in the recitation-room, that it is surely an object to counteract it as far as possible by examples that shall not only be clear, but also, making due allowance for differences of idiom, as concise or nervous or elegant as the original. And this, too, will help to inspire a literary interest in the text-book, which the classics in these days can ill afford to lose.

We proceed to make a few remarks in detail upon such points as have seemed worthy of further notice or illustration. And should they be thought too minutely verbal, we need only say that they have been suggested by a sense of the tendencies and the wants of students, which has been forced on us by daily experience.

Preface, p. vii. "We are, therefore, compelled, in the face of the statement of the Didaskalia, etc." Richter, also (Class. Mus. No. XXV.), raises the question, whether this Didaskalia may not be spurious. But, even allowing it to be genuine, we may suppose, with Franz (who first published it), that there were *two* Theban trilogies, connected with each other; the first, that given in the Didaskalia, followed immediately in the representation by

the second, consisting of the *Argives*, the *Eleusinians*, and the *Epigoni*. And, even if this fail to satisfy, and we should be forced to admit the addition following the funeral lament, to be an error in judgment, yet, as has been remarked, "if Schiller, and even Shakspeare, on occasion, could err in such matters, much more Aeschylus."

Notes, V. 1. "After *χρή* supply *ἐκείνον*." An example of unnecessary ellipsis. It seems better to say that *τινέ*, contained in *ὅστις*, is the subject of *λέγαν*, attracted into the relative clause. V. 3. "*οἶαξ* is the helm or rudder." Strictly the tiller, and *πηδάλιον* the rudder. Further on in the same note, we should prefer to say that *μή* designates the person as *indefinite*, rather than as "merely possible." V. 4. "*αἷτα θεῶν*, sc. *ἂν εἴη*." A simple and concise ellipsis would be *ἐστὶ, the occasion is the gods*'. V. 7. The transition in the meanings of *φροῦμον* would be more plainly seen by translating *murmurs*, a word used alike of musical and of complaining strains. V. 15. Without understanding *ὥστε*, the Inf. here, as often, may be regarded as the Dat. of *that for which* the aid is given. V. 24. "*βοτήρ, ὁ ποιμήν, the lord*." Is not *βοτήρ* (herdsman) used here in the sense of *watcher*? As the herdsman is the watcher of his flock, so Tiresias of the birds of omen. V. 28. The remark on *Ἀχαιῶα* is not quite consistent with that on *προσβολήν*. V. 29. The sense of *παρηγορέω* would seem also to favor Bloomfield. V. 31. "*σοῦνθε*, from the Attic *σώω*." Is there an Attic *σώω*? Better, an Attic form, which supposes a theme *σάω*.

V. 38. Here, and elsewhere, we would avoid conveying the idea, that certain expressions are exact equivalents, i. e. might be used indifferently, the state or view of the mind *remaining the same*. Such statements sometimes give the pupil an impression, that the usage of language is loose and inexact, and therefore not worth searching out, when really, in all its varieties of expression for the same general idea, there is a beautiful distinctness, and for each an assignable reason. In the present instance, the Aor. Subj. has the general force of the Fut., but, specifically, it expresses a more earnest and inward feeling, than the simple future would do; not simply, *I shall not be*, but, as we say, *I cannot be taken*, it cannot be that I shall be taken. So V. 50, the Sing. *δάκρυ* differs from *δάκρυα* in rhetorical significance; V. 104. *οὐχ ἐνός* means more to the feeling than *πολλῶν*; V. 62. "*κεδνός*, i. q. *ἀγαθός*" generically, but specifically, *heedful, wary* helmsman; V. 105. "*γῆ* has often the force of *πόλις*," yet always carries the idea of its dependent territory.

V. 40. *σαφῆ τὰκείμεν* is rather = *τὰ σ. τὰκ.*, the Art. being omitted with *σ.*, because expressed with the defining word. V. 42. "*Θούριος* — In Homer the word is only used as an epithet of Ares." The form in Homer is *Θούριος*. V. 53. More exactly, and, therefore, more forcibly, *as of lions glaring war*, and below, *looking terror*. V. 63. Does *καταγ.* in *itself* express more than a single momentary action, without reference to time, *before the blasts of A. rush down*? V. 69. The peculiar formation of *πολιωσ.* is not noticed in the lexicons and might be here — *πολι* — *σο* — *εχω* — with the connecting syllable.

ble -οο-, as in *μυξοβόρραρος*. V. 73. *δομ. ἐφ.* = our *fireside homes*. V. 75. The Inf. is used with the conciseness natural to sudden exclamation or urgent entreaty, and *οὐ* that they (may) never hold. The change of mode seems to imply a change of subj. to *δῖους*, contained in *δῆλτων*. In V. 253, we have an instance of the same usage, the brevity of agonized feeling, unconscious of ellipsis, which, therefore, we need not supply. *Gods of my city, that I may not meet with slavery*. V. 79. The editor adopts the usual method of printing the choral passages. We have often wished these portions of the dramatic authors might be broken up in the printing, the strophic movements being separated from each other and also from the continuous chant, more in the style of modern lyric verse. This arrangement would be more agreeable to the eye, and present a less formidable aspect to the student, who wanders for the first time bewildered through these difficult and sometimes almost impenetrable portions of the drama. V. 113. We should, as we have suggested, prefer a more literal translation of compound epithets, unless it would be obviously forced and un-English. The power of our language to represent the Greek in this respect, picture for picture, has perhaps been thought more limited than it really is. We might render here, *the wave of slanting-plumed (drooping-plumed) warriors*. V. 117. The mythological significance of *παιτλῆς* is worthy of notice here, as indicating the dominant sovereignty of Zeus, "who alone can conduct to a happy end every undertaking, under whatever auspices commenced." Comp. Sup. vv. 523, 820. V. 130. Another reason has been found for the epithet *ῥιπίος* in "the analogy of the waves, over which his car rides, to the fleet ambling of horses." V. 156. We add an English example we have somewhere seen quoted in illustration of this expressive use of the Greek pers. pron.: "A good sherris sack hath a two-fold operation in it; it ascends *me* into the brain; dries *me* there all the foolish," etc. Shakspeare, Henry IV. Part II. Act IV. Scene III. V. 195. "The Opt. with *ἄν* softens the assertion." *ἄν* seems rather to imply a condition, which is here incorporated in the Part. *οὐρακαὶον*. The use of *τοί* might well be explained here, as also in maxims (v. 438). V. 201. "*τίθει*, second person, etc. from the old form *τιθεῖω*." The language is ambiguous, as it might lead to the inference that this is not the regular Imper. of *τίθημι*; *τίθει* does not occur. V. 243. *Ἀπαλλῆς* is stronger than *receive*; *seize* at is better. V. 245. "*καὶ μὴν*, and yet *shear*." Rather, *and indeed I do hear*, or *ay, and indeed I hear (already)*. These particles often thus introduce a new incident or person. *γέ* gives force to *ἀν.*, which may be expressed by the stress of the voice, or often in dialogue answers to our introductory affirmation, *ay* or *yes*. V. 250. With Elmsley's pointing, *οὐ* must be understood with the second clause: *Wait, you be silent (wait you), say nothing of this?* V. 251. Is there an allusion in *ἐντέλεια* to the political meaning of the word, as if the deities were to *contribute jointly* to relieve the burden of the Theban state? V. 266. The rendering here does not quite bring out the force of the art. and the apposition, *pray that better prayer* (more prevailing, effi-

cacious). V. 268. The two senses of *εἶμ.* resolve themselves into one, as what is propitiatory is poetically called *propitious*. Hence a new sense need not be assumed. V. 273. "οὐδ' ἀπ' Ἰσμηνοῦ λέγω." The conject. of Lud. Dindorf, as given by the Oxf. Transl., deserves mention here — ἰδοαί τ' Ἰσμηνοῦ λέγω — which gives an easier sense.

V. 323. We should decidedly prefer the construction which the editor rejects. It seems to us the least harsh of the two, and the verbal meaning and government here given to *δουλίαν* are unsupported. The const. of *ψ. σπ.* with *περθ.*, as Dat. of manner (or accomp. circ.), is certainly not a forced one. Vv. 357, 359. Why may we not render *ἀλγίνει κρηούς*, *causes grief as it meets the view* (lit. *when it has met the view*)? V. 373. The sentence explains itself without ellipsis, as in English: *And lo! (μῆν) yonder the king himself, just in time to learn.* The const. of the Noms. is analogous to that of the Nom. Indep. in descriptive address (Cros. § 343), while *μαθεῖν* is Dat. after *δοτ.* V. 374. As the conjectural emendations here, even in the editor's view, are not very satisfactory, we may at least make one more effort to save the Vulg., and render: *Haste too does not complete his step*, i. e. does not allow a long full step, causes him to take short, rapid ones. *καί* compares the king's haste with that of the messenger. V. 402. The primary meaning of *μάντις* is more forcible here: *Haply the conceit might prove to one a prophet*, i. e. prophetic. V. 411. "*μή φιλεῖ*" is equivalent to *στυγεί.* But can this be so, when the clause is clearly absolute? We think *μή* here belongs with *κακός*, and is used because one of a class is meant, *loves to be one who is not* (i. e. such as is not) *cowardly*. Or it may simply be the dependent negative with *εἶναι*, as if it were *τὸ μή κ. ε.*, *the not being cowardly*. V. 423. The name of the gate here named is the *Electran*, rather than "*Electream*." V. 424. *ἄλλος* here agrees with *γίγας* only by a species of attraction, instead of taking it as an appositive — *γίγας ὃδ' ἄλλος* being = *ἀνὴρ ὃδ' ἄλλος, δηλοῦντι γίγας*. Lit. *this other man, a giant*, i. e. this further, next, newly-mentioned man (see Wunder on Soph. Phil. 38. Krüg. § 50, 4, Obs. 11). The peculiar use of *ἐπιλωμένη* in v. 433, and the sudden change of construction in v. 435, seem to deserve remark in a note. V. 437. "which is an advantage to us," etc. Rather (from this boasting), which he thinks an advantage to him, because he expects thus to overawe us, we shall draw an advantage for ourselves, viz. his sudden destruction. V. 498. "*πρὸς ἀλκῇ*," with all his might." The editor translates according to the analogy of *πρὸς βίαν* and similar phrases. This usage with *ἀλκῇ* is, so far as we know, without example, and the meaning (strictly, *in the way of might, mightily*) not very forcible in connection with the strong expressions of the same clause. Nor is it so appropriate to the usual sense of *ἀλκῇ*, which is not *strength* in general, but a particular kind or exercise of it, *strength in defence or repulse*. We should, therefore, prefer to render here, as the editor has done in v. 876, *raves for fight*.

V. 544. The latter part of this note seems to contradict the former. The words *ἀνδρὶ τῷδε* are first referred (and, as we think, rightly) to "the Cad-

mean" (so that very many Theban missiles are hurled upon this man, their own countryman), but afterwards, apparently, to Parthenopæus. V. 682. The rhetorical expressiveness of the Nom. Indep. might here have been noticed. Vv. 683—685. The old pointing seems certainly preferable here. The antithesis is then more forcible and fully carried out; *if one suffer ill without dishonor, be it so; for 'tis the only privilege among the dead; but from ills AND disgraces (ills that are also disgraces), you can tell of no good fame.* V. 690. "*which has been allotted to them.*" The intrans. use of *λαχόν* is rare out of Homer and not frequent with him. The usual trans. meaning is a perfectly easy one here, *λαχόν* being taken as agreeing with *γένος* and having *κῆμα* for its object. V. 696. We were surprised at the reference of the words *ἐρηοῖς*—*ἄμματα* to Eteocles, which quite destroys the impressive beauty of the personification. *Τέλεα*, if retained, must be taken adverbially, lit. *consummatingly*, i. e. executively, with resolution to accomplish itself, inexorably. V. 731. *διαπήλας*, "lit. *having shaken through*," rather, *apart*, Lat. *dis*-. Vv. 742—749. The pointing of this passage is incorrect and would confuse the student. There should be at most a colon only after *μένει*, v. 744, and a comma after *πάντα*, v. 749. The clause with *εὔτε* extends to *ἔτλα*, v. 756. If *αἰῶνα*—*μένει* be taken as the leading clause, then *εὔτε*—*since*. It may, however, be taken as parenthetical, and *καλῶς*—*ἀνύτ*. be regarded as the leading one, in which case *εὔτε*—*when*. The latter is the more natural construction, as the clause with *εὔτε* seems intended to explain *παρβασιάν*. V. 800. According to Lobeck (quoted by Pässe), Apollo was thus called, because seven boys and seven girls led the processions at his feasts. "Phoebus receives the *seventh gate*, because, as the prophet of the doom, it was his special business to see it fulfilled, and this he could do only there, where the devoted heads of Et. and Pol. stood" (Blackie). V. 815. Comp. Matth. 414, 12. Soph. Aj. 136 with Gray's note. V. 859. "*Τὸν δευβῆ' πόλλων.*" According to Schütz, "*quia εἰδης et τετραταρος invisa diis superis loca sunt.*" The expression seems to imply that on the Delian *θεωρίς*, sent to the Pan-Ionic festival in his honor, Apollo was mystically present, but this gloomy *θεωρίς* of the dead was a far different one, untrodden by that radiant sun-god. Vv. 868, 869. The translation here is ambiguous. Vv. 908, 909. There is evidently a misprint here. The Greek requires *mediator* or *arbitr.* V. 1005. *That which seemed good and has therefore been decreed*, would perhaps more exactly express Schütz's interpretation. V. 1078. The construction of *τὰ μάλιστα* is deserving of a note. Of the two possible constructions, with *κατακλ.* or with *ἤνευε*, the latter seems the true one, *he defended the city best*. Its position is thus emphatic, and gives a sense in keeping with the feelings of the semi-chorus.

We may add, that we have noticed the usual want of uniformity in the substitution of *k* for *c* in proper names. Thus we find *Eteocles* throughout, *Siculus*, *Arcadia*, *Alcestis*, *Coloneus*, etc. We confess to an old-fashioned preference for the Latin forms, which have been customary among scholars, ever since Latin became their common language, and Greek the subject of their comments.

The volume is printed in the attractive style of the Cambridge press. The typographical errors we have observed are doubtless owing to the distance of the editor from the press.

In concluding our notice, we will only express again the pleasure we have derived from our examination of this edition, and our hope that the editor will soon lay us under new obligations to his scholarship and taste.

II. EBRARD ON HEBREWS, IN CONTINUATION OF OLSHAUSEN.¹

BIBLICAL students will hail with pleasure this work in continuation of Olshausen's Commentary on the New Testament. Professor Ebrard is well known as the author of a Critical Inquiry into the Evangelical History,² in which the mythical hypothesis of Strauss is handled with unsparing severity, as well as of several other able theological treatises. In his general views he agrees with the lamented author, of whose work the present volume is a continuation. In regard to the disputed questions relating to the Epistle to the Hebrews, the following is a brief statement of his position.

As to its *character*, he holds that it is neither a mere theological treatise, written not at all for a definite circle of readers, nor a simple epistle in the ordinary sense of the word, but something between the two; a treatise so far as relates to the manner in which its contents are represented, but an epistle "in so far as relates to the destination for a definite circle of readers." The most probable explanation of this its particular form, in respect to which it is distinguished from all the other New Testament Epistles, he finds in the hypothesis that it was originally designed to be a treatise for a definite circle of readers, and was accompanied by a shorter epistle, properly so called, with the usual epistolary superscription, which is now lost. The circle of readers for whose use it was prepared he finds, for reasons that do not appear to us entirely satisfactory, only in Jerusalem, consisting of those Jewish Christians who were laboring under "*the terrible feeling of being shut out from the old theocratical sanctuary*," and "it is directed solely against the sin of faint-heartedness, never against intentional error."

The *time* of the composition he places between A. D. 58 and 66; most probably in A. D. 62, not long before the death of Paul.

As to the *author*, he justly remarks, that the *external* authority preponderates on the side of its Pauline origin. The Eastern church, decidedly and from the very first, held the Epistle to be Pauline; and its unanimous and positive testimony cannot be set aside by the opposing testimony of the Western church, which he shows to have been of a negative character, proceeding from an ignorance of the Epistle and its author, with no positive

¹ Biblical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, in continuation of the Work of Olshausen. By Dr. John H. A. Ebrard, Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. Translated from the German, by Rev. John Fulton, A. M., Garvald. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1853.

² Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte.

statement respecting him except the single testimony of Tertullian. In the fourth century the Western church followed the oriental tradition, a change which "can only be explained by the fact that the Eastern church must have had *weighty positive reasons in support of it*."

The objection to the Pauline origin of the Epistle, drawn from its *doctrines* and *alleged allegorizing spirit*, he sets aside in a very able and satisfactory manner. On the subject of "allegorical interpretation," the following extract contains the substance of his argument:

"The supposed 'allegorical interpretation' of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews, or, more correctly, the *typology* in this Epistle, consists simply in the author's showing that the *types were only types*, i. e. in other words, that no prophecy found a *perfect* fulfilment in the old covenant, that all fulfilments rather pointed always again to a further future. It was, for example, no arbitrary allegorizing, but pure objective truth to say, that the state of separation between God and the people under the old covenant, the existence of two compartments in the tabernacle, a Holy of Holies, and a *πρότερον ἁγίου*, the necessity of ever-repeated sacrifices, pointed to a relation of man to God which was not yet established. This typology, however, we find also in Paul's writings. When Paul, Gal. iv., sees in the two wives of Abraham and their sons — of whom one was by nature the elder, and yet was rejected, while the other, as the possessor of the promise of grace, was the heir — a typical foreshadowing of the relation between the national posterity of Abraham, the legally righteous, natural Israel, and the New Testament Israel holding fast the promise, this is just such a typology as we find in the Epistle to the Hebrews, nay, a bolder instance of it. But the fact that such typologies occur seldom, and by the by, in Paul's writings, while in the Epistle to the Hebrews they form the substance of the writing, is naturally to be accounted for by the *aim and object* of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is, to consider the Old Testament institutions with the intent to discover whether, and in how far, they point forwards to something more perfect."¹

The *diction* of the Epistle as a whole he finds to be "in a *more select style* than the Pauline epistles." After an examination of this on various points, he sums up the whole argument from the internal character in the following words: "All these considerations are so forcible and conclusive that we can say nothing else than this: *By how much the spirit and doctrine of the Epistle is Pauline, by so little can it be supposed that this diction should have come from the hand of the Apostle.*"² Of the various hypotheses that have been adopted to reconcile the strong external authority for the Pauline origin of the Epistle and its marked Pauline spirit and doctrine, on the one side, with its un-Pauline diction and drapery, on the other, he adopts the following: that Luke was commissioned by the Apostle Paul, who was himself in prison, to work out the Epistle in his name; so that the tradition of the Eastern church which unanimately ascribes it to Paul is, for substance, correct; while yet its diction did not proceed immediately from either the lips or the pen of the great Apostle to the Gentiles.

¹ Appendix, Chap. V. p. 410.

² Ibid. p. 419.

We do not propose to go here into any discussion concerning this hypothesis, much less to endorse it. This merit it has, however, that it leaves the canonical authority of the Epistle uninjured, which is a point of vital importance.

III. ALEXANDER'S CONNECTION OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.¹

FOR reasons familiar to every Biblical scholar, the question of the connection between the Old and New Testaments, has become one of commanding interest at the present day. A favorite method of assault on revealed religion, and one that is zealously prosecuted not only by avowed unbelievers, but also by some that sit in the chair of theology and profess to teach the Christian system, is on the side of the Old Testament. Some of these writers seem ready to receive the New Testament as containing, if not an inspired, yet a real record of a revelation from God, if they can first dis sever it from its connection with the Old Testament. But, that the religion taught in the New Testament is only a full development of that contained in the Old, and as such, indissolubly connected with it, as a part of one great whole, they will not allow. The Messiah of the New Testament, in particular, they affirm to be not the Messiah of the old Hebrew prophets, but one possessed of radically different attributes and offices. Hence it follows, that these prophets did not speak "as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," but only gave utterance to their own hopes respecting the future, in dreams as gorgeous as they were unsubstantial.

But this attempt to saw asunder the two parts of Divine revelation, has proved itself a hopeless task; for, to use the words of our author, we have no alternative but "to admit the Divine authority of the Old Testament, and its harmony with the New, as among those truths to which Christianity is pledged by its Divine author and his apostles."² And the commitment is so full, and made in so many forms, that the attempt to disjoin the New Testament from the Old, is very much like an effort to dissect out of the human body the system of blood vessels, or of muscles and tendons, without injury to the other parts. All this is shown by the author in a solid and satisfactory manner. After a brief discussion of the *external* or *literary* connection of the Old and New Testaments, he comes to the main question, that of their *internal* or *doctrinal* connection. This he discusses under the following heads: doctrines respecting the Divine nature; doctrines respecting the Divine character, and condition and prospects of man; criteria and characteristics of the Messianic prophecies, with a survey of the prophecies

¹ The Connection and Harmony of the Old and New Testaments: being an Inquiry into the Relations Literary and Doctrinal, in which these two Parts of the Sacred Volume stand to each other. By William Lindsay Alexander, D. D. New and Uniform Edition. The Congregational Lecture. Second Series. London: Jackson and Walford, 18, St. Paul's Churchyard. 1853. 12mo. pp. xvi. and 432.

² P. 20.

in their several successive stages; and an examination of some of the leading types of Christ in the Old Testament, under which division is considered the general typical character of the Levitical institutions. Our limits will not permit us to follow the author in detail through this rich field of investigation. We shall confine ourselves to a brief notice of his position and arguments on some points of vital importance.

One of these is, *the condition and prospects of man*. If the Old and New Testaments constitute a whole, then it is manifest that the explanation of the redemption revealed in the New Testament, must be found in the fallen condition of man as taught in the Old Testament. For the defenders of the unity of the Holy Scriptures this is a strong, an impregnable point, of which Dr. Alexander has not failed to avail himself. Not to enter here upon the discussion of any vexed question respecting the manner of our connection with Adam, it is sufficient to say, that he has shown very clearly that the New Testament writers assume the historic verity of the Old Testament narrative of our first parents's fall, and, in them, of the fall of the human race, as the basis of the salvation provided for men in the Gospel; so that thus the Old Testament and the New are, in their inmost essence, one and indivisible.

Another point of vital importance is, *the nature and interpretation of prophecy*, especially of *Messianic prophecy*. Here Dr. Alexander adopts, in opposition to the idea of a twofold fulfilment, the *literal* and the *spiritual*, that of "a gradual, or, as Hurd gives it, 'a germinant and springing' fulfilment;" and he quotes with approbation the following words of Bacon:

"In this matter that latitude must be admitted which is proper and familiar to the Divine predictions; viz. that their fulfilment should take place continuously as well as punctually. For they bespeak the nature of their Author, with whom 'one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day;' and, though the plenitude and summit of their accomplishment may be, for the most part, destined to some particular age, or even given moment of time, yet have they in the meantime certain grades and stages of fulfilment, through different ages of the world."¹

This we hold to be, for the great body of Messianic prophecy, the only true principle of interpretation. And we are inclined to think that some, at least, of those who now employ the words "*double sense*," do not differ essentially from this view. To take a familiar illustration. The words of the Psalmist: "Wherefore do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?" have "the plenitude and summit of their accomplishment" under the Christian dispensation. But this does not exclude a "germinant" accomplishment under David, who was, by the Divine appointment, the visible earthly head of the same church of God of which Christ is, in a high and incommunicable sense, "head over all things." One might say, therefore, that this prophecy was fulfilled under David in a lower sense, and under Christ in a higher sense; meaning that the invincible nature of God's king-

¹ De Augment. Scient. lib. ii. c. 11, *sub init.*, quoted on pp. 167, 168.

dom, which is from the beginning to the end one and indivisible, was manifested under David in a lower, and, under Christ, in a higher form. Some would call this "a twofold fulfilment," but it is in reality only the "germinant and springing" fulfilment for which our author rightly contends.

A third point is, *the typical nature of the Mosaic institutions*, which Dr. Alexander firmly maintains, while he rejects the extravagance of those who treat "the histories of Scripture as if they were mere contrivances for the adumbration of spiritual truth—in other words—mere parables."¹ He recognizes the typical character of the nation of Israel, with good reason, we think, not only in the rites and ceremonies of the Levitical ritual, but also in the entire system of social and political relations established by Moses under the Divine direction; so that in this way "a twofold character came to belong to many of the sacred institutes of the Mosaic ritual; the one arising from their relation to the nation as a visible community; the other, from their being symbolical of certain spiritual truths, and typical of the facts of the Christian revelation."² He shows, further, that in interpreting types, we must lay mere persons and things out of view, and confine ourselves to Divine institutions. "It was not David, or Manasseh, or Ahab, that was the type of Christ, as King of Zion; it was the *royal office* with which these were invested, symbolical as that was of the theocracy, which was typical of the kingly dignity of the Redeemer."³

In some of his positions, as, for example, that which respects the degree of knowledge of the resurrection possessed by the Old Testament writers, he will, we presume, fail to carry the conviction of all his readers. In so wide and difficult a field as that of the connection between the Old Testament and the New, diversity of judgment must always exist, even among those who are agreed on the essential points at issue with unbelievers. But the work as a whole will, we are fully persuaded, commend itself to the friends of spiritual Christianity as a timely and able treatise.

IV. ALEXANDER'S CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY.⁴

ANOTHER treatise from the pen of Dr. Alexander, consisting of two parts. In the former of these, he vindicates the genuineness and uncorrupt preservation of the four Gospels, in opposition to the hypothesis of an original gospel which has been interpolated, and also to the mythic hypothesis. In the second part, he constructs an argument for the Divine origin of Christianity from the personal character of Christ, from the miraculous events in his life, from the predictions which he uttered, and from his public teaching as a herald of Divine truth. The argument is conducted in a solid and satisfactory manner.

¹ P. 311.

² P. 325.

³ P. 315.

⁴ Christ and Christianity: a Vindication of the Divine Authority of the Christian Religion, grounded on the Historical Verity of the Life of Christ. By William Lindsay Alexander, D. D. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black. 1854.

V. BARNES ON DANIEL.¹

THIS we think the ablest of all Mr. Barnes's volumes on the Bible. For common readers, we do not hesitate to pronounce it the best commentary on the book of *Daniel* that we have ever seen. Though designed for popular use, it is a work which no scholar, however versed and skilled in exegesis, can read without pleasure and great advantage. In fact, it approaches very near to our highest ideal of the right kind of commentary for intelligent laymen. The author has thoroughly examined the rationalistic theories for the interpretation of these remarkable prophecies, and found and proved them to be utterly unsatisfactory and groundless; he has carefully surveyed all the known facts of ancient history adapted to throw light on the subject, and stated the results in language simple, perspicuous and chaste; he proposes his own expositions with modest decision and entire clearness, and his arguments on every contested point are frank, full, and eminently to the purpose.

The entire deference to the authority of the sacred writers, the clear recognition of the perfect inspiration of the Scriptures, the unmistakable reception of the New Testament writers as divinely authorized and infallible interpreters of the Old, the tone of reverence and piety everywhere manifest, distinguish this work above many others written by professedly orthodox commentators of the present and past generation. Some who esteem themselves evangelical, would seem to prefer, on a question of exegesis, the authority of a German rationalist to that of Peter or Paul or even of Christ himself; and openly treat with gross disrespect that same Old Testament which Jesus and his apostles revered as the true word of the Omniscient God. We have had enough of this, and too much; let it stop.

Two things we must find fault with. (1) The book abounds with typographical errors. The author was probably unable to correct the proof-sheets himself, on account of that disease of the eyes which we all so much regret and so earnestly desire to have removed. (2) For the sake of compressing the book into the smallest possible space, much of it is printed with a type so small, that to study the work as it ought to be studied, would soon reduce the reader's eyes to the same sad condition from which the writer is suffering. We fully sympathize with Mr. Barnes's abhorrence of big books; but this abhorrence may be carried too far. This commentary, no less than the commentaries on *Job* and *Isaiah*, is well worthy of two large, fair volumes; and we hope soon to see it in such a form, that we may be able ourselves to read it with comfort, and no longer be afraid to recommend it to students in this day of failing eyes.

¹ Notes, Critical, Illustrative and Practical, on the Book of *Daniel*, with an Introductory Dissertation, by Albert Barnes. New York: Leavitt and Allen. 1853. 12mo. pp. 494.

VI. PROFESSOR EADIE ON THE EPHESIANS.¹

THE United Presbyterian Church of Scotland is one of the most intelligent, earnest, liberal and agreeable of the religious denominations of the Old world. It owes its origin to the labors of the Erskines and their associates; and the sect as a body does honor to a parentage so illustrious. The Christian scholar who visits Scotland, will always find himself in congenial society when with the ministers and members of the United Presbyterian Church. The names of Dr. John Brown of Edinburgh, of Dr. John Robson of Glasgow, and many others, recall the ideas of orthodoxy without bigotry, of sound learning without pedantry, and of the most agreeable social qualities united with sober and consistent piety.

Of this church Dr. Eadie is a distinguished ornament. He is a laborious teacher and a prolific writer. His numerous works all aim at utility, and they have been remarkably popular. Some of them in a few years have reached even a thirteenth and a fourteenth edition; and, when we consider that they are all theological books of the most serious and chaste sort, this rapid and extensive circulation is the best kind of commendation both of the author and of his Scottish countrymen. The theological literature of Glasgow did not die with the lamented Wardlaw. There are still left Eadie, and Taylor, and King, and Jamieson, and many others, highly distinguished both as preachers and writers. Indeed, it is matter of surprise to the stranger that there can be such an amount of literary labor of the first order in the busy, dingy, smoky, crowded, money-making, manufacturing city of Glasgow. Yet, from the very heart of the Middle Ages, philosophy and theology, poetry and history, science and art have found a genial home in Glasgow; and they still dwell there, amid the lurid fires of numberless furnaces, and the clattering hammers of that endless line of ship-yards along the Clyde, where ships are constructed of solid iron, as if the sons of St. Mungo would say to sneering Samuel Johnson: "If we have no trees, we need them not; our sharp-sightedness has discovered beneath the soil a material far better than timber, and our skill and industry can work it up."

The Epistle to the Ephesians is one of the most interesting and important books of the New Testament. Next to the Epistle to the Romans, it is the most thoroughly and systematically doctrinal of all the writings of Paul which have come down to our times; and, like the Romans, it most obstinately refuses to take any form in exegesis except one run in the Augustinian-Calvinistic mould. On this Epistle, Dr. Eadie has laid out lustily his strength, and made vigorous application of his extensive and varied learning. He draws interesting and apt illustrations from all sources; not only from the wide range of English and Scotch theological literature, but from the

¹ A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, by John Eadie, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Biblical Literature to the United Presbyterian Church. London and Glasgow. 1853. 8vo. pp. 466.

Greek and Latin fathers, the subtle Schoolmen of the Middle Ages, the stalwart Reformers, the French theologians, the poets of older times and such moderns as Goethe and Longfellow, and especially from the exhaustless stores of German erudition in philology and criticism, in history and theology. We know not where else to find information so full and complete on this book of the New Testament. It is one of the many encouraging indications of the present time, that we are no longer to depend exclusively on Germany for Biblical commentaries of the highest order in respect to erudition and literature. The strong good sense of the British and American mind is now most successfully at work in this fruitful field.

VII. CHRIST AS MADE KNOWN TO THE ANCIENT CHURCH.¹

THIS is the first instalment of a work intended to occupy four volumes in all. It is printed from the manuscript of its late author, and comprises a series of discourses delivered by him to the congregation in Edinburgh of which he was pastor. As Dr. Gordon was for many years one of the foremost men in the religious world of Scotland, it may be desirable, before noticing his book, to give our readers a brief sketch of his life and character. Few men, indeed, have of late years appeared in Scotland, who have commanded a larger measure of genuine respect and esteem from men of all parties in his own country; though, from a certain unobtrusiveness and perhaps shyness of natural temperament, he did not make himself known by deeds that might have published his fame in other countries. In Edinburgh he stood very high in public respect. Endowed with mental powers of no ordinary kind; bearing in his very exterior an aspect of nobleness; in the habit of weekly addressing multitudes whom the force of his thinking, the deep intensity of his utterance, and the prophet-like earnestness of his whole manner, at once impressed and charmed; and, carrying with him through life a character on which no blot or shadow had ever fallen, he had come to gather around him a full tide of that spontaneous homage which public feeling never fails to yield to intellectual power when associated with integrity and goodness.

Dr. Gordon was a native of Dumfries. His first settlement in the ministry was at Kinfauns, near Perth, to the church and parish of which he was presented by Lord Gray. He was ordained there in 1816, and in 1820 he was translated to the Old Chapel of Ease in Edinburgh. His success as a preacher in the metropolis rendered it desirable that a more commodious place should be provided for him; and, accordingly, he was shortly after transferred to Newington Church, where he preached with undiminished popularity till 1825, when he became one of the ministers of the High Church. Here the movement which ended in the withdrawal of the Free Church

¹ Christ as made known to the Ancient Church: An Exposition of the Revelation of Divine Grace as unfolded in the Old Testament Scriptures. By the late Robert Gordon, D. D., F. M. S. E., Edinburgh. 2 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter. 1854.

from the Church of Scotland found him; and, as that movement had from the first possessed his hearty sympathy, he was prompt to obey the summons which called him to resign his preferment, and join his brethren who, for conscience' sake, were relinquishing their ecclesiastical connection with the State. Nearly the whole of his congregation followed him, and he continued to labor among them up to the period of his death, as minister of the Free High Church. In prospect of the approaching sacrament, in October last, he was engaged in preparing a sermon to be delivered on that occasion, when he was seized with a stroke of paralysis, which terminated fatally. It is worthy of notice, that, just before laying down his pen, the last words he wrote were: "O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory?"

Dr. Gordon presented, in the constitution of his mind, a union but rarely exemplified, of strength with gentleness, of compactness with discursiveness. In early life his pursuits were, by choice chiefly, in the department of the exact sciences. His genius was essentially mathematical; and there is reason to conclude, from his earlier essays, that, had he devoted himself to mathematical and scientific studies, his place might have been among the foremost of those who are eminent in these departments at the present day. But considerations higher than those of natural inclination, had led him to devote himself to the service of religion; and, for excelling in this sphere, he was also remarkably well fitted. With his taste for exact science, there was combined a breadth of reflectiveness, an ardor of feeling, and an apprehension of the force of moral reasoning, which are too often wanting in those who have addicted themselves to mathematical studies. There was nothing dry or merely formal in his modes of thought. He did not insist upon seeing everything under a particular angle. He did not bring everything to be measured by a given line. He could appreciate and estimate truth, even though it was not of a kind to be demonstrated. His mathematical tendencies and pursuits but served to give precision to his views in other departments, and to preserve him from the looseness and inconsequence of thought too often characterizing the harangues of undisciplined teachers.

As a preacher, Dr. Gordon was distinguished by the closeness and consecutiveness of his reasoning, the energy of his elocution, the pathos and solemnity of his appeals, and the rich vein of Scriptural sentiment and practical elucidation which pervaded his discourses. In his published sermons we do not mark any peculiar indications either of the scientific theologian or the learned interpreter. But, viewing them as pieces of sacred oratory, designed to persuade men to piety and virtue, they seem to us to occupy a foremost place in the department to which they belong. In all of them a definite purpose is kept in view; argument, persuasion, entreaty, are brought to bear with admirable skill and effect upon the securing of that purpose; the reader is borne along as on a swift rushing stream; and the whole is wound up with a sudden abruptness that seems to cast him with irresistible force on the point at which the preacher has all along been aiming. When to the equalities of matter and method were added, in delivery, the dignified

aspect, the solemn tone, the earnest gesture, the pleading look of the preacher, we can well believe that it was oftentimes with a sort of hushed awe that he was listened to, as if one of the old prophets had risen from the dead, and was pleading with men in the name of their God.

In private life, Dr. Gordon drew to himself alike the love and reverence of all who knew him. Sternly inflexible, where the interests of truth and integrity were concerned, he was, in all other respects, "gentle and easy to be entreated." In general society, he united to the manners of a gentleman a certain scholarly simplicity, which was unspeakably charming. In the eye of the public, he stood forth a thoroughly honest man; and, in the circle of intimate friendship and family affection, his gentleness, meekness and loving-kindness, made all hearts his. The memory of such a man is blessed.

During his lifetime, Dr. Gordon published but little. Immersed in parochial and pastoral duties, he had but little time for the labors of the press; nor does he seem to have had either any of the *cacoethes scribendi*, or any great ambition to be distinguished as an author. A volume of sermons and a few minor pieces constitute the whole of his previous contributions to literature. In the volumes before us, he appears still as a sermon-writer. No attempt is made here to investigate critically the amount of knowledge possessed by the ancient church concerning the person and work of Christ. The author contents himself with a purely homiletical development of the elements of spiritual knowledge enunciated in the historical books, involved in the historical events, or adumbrated in the institutions of the Old Testament. In a theological or exegetical point of view, the work makes no pretensions to distinction; but, in richness of evangelical thought, in closeness of practical application, in cogency of doctrinal inference, and in high-toned spirituality of sentiment, few works of modern authorship will, in our opinion, be found to possess higher claims. It is eminently a book for the closet of the meditative Christian; and to such it will open many fields of fruitful and pleasant thought. There is a breadth and power about the author's mode of dealing with his subject which, to minds of a reflective cast, cannot but prove eminently attractive. If he seldom stops to solve minor difficulties, it is that he may unfold large and comprehensive views in the domain of sacred knowledge; and over that domain he treads with the firm step and commanding mien of one to whom all its parts are well known, and its richest treasures unlocked. Two volumes are to follow on the more direct Messianic announcements of the prophets.

VIII. COLEMAN'S HISTORICAL TEXT-BOOK AND ATLAS OF BIBLICAL GEOGRAPHY.¹

WE have, in a former number, called the attention of our readers to Dr. Coleman's "Historical Geography of the Bible," the first edition of which

¹ An Historical Text-book and Atlas of Biblical Geography. By Lyman Coleman. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1854. 8vo. 319 half pages.

appeared in 1849, and which contains a great amount of valuable matter condensed into a small space. The present work fully sustains the author's well-established reputation for indefatigable industry and accurate research. In the preface he tells us, that, while the general plan of the book is the same as that of the *Historical Geography of the Bible*, it is not an abridgment of that work, but "a separate, independent treatise, which has called the writer to a new and extended course of reading, preparatory to the task of constructing this *Text-book and Atlas*." The descriptive portion, combining the two elements of history and geography, and arranged in successive periods, is less full than in the *Historical Geography*, the author having aimed to compress it "into the narrowest limits that seemed compatible with the design of presenting a satisfactory compend of the wide range of Biblical geography, chronology and history, without reducing it to a barren, repulsive series of isolated statistics." The maps, on the other hand, are far more full and valuable. These are beautifully engraved on steel on the basis of Kiepert's *Bible Atlas*, compared with that of Wieland and Ackerman, and also the maps of Robinson, Wilson, Lynch, Layard and Chesney; thus giving the result of the most recent researches in the department of sacred geography. The subject of sacred chronology has received special attention, and the result of the author's investigations are embodied in a valuable *Chronological Table*. The *General Index*, at the close of the volume, is not the least among the helps which it offers to the Biblical student. It contains a full list of Scriptural proper names with references to the passages where they occur.

In his statements of conflicting opinions, Dr. Coleman shows great candor, his aim being to lay before his readers the different points at issue as fully as it can be done in so concise a treatise. In respect to some of the judgments which he expresses concerning them, there is room for diversity of opinion. With our present light we should not always coincide with him. In the present state of Biblical geography, one may well reserve to himself the right of dissent from an author on certain points, without disparagement to the general excellence of his work. The treatise deserves, and will, we doubt not, receive an extended circulation. It is a convenient manual for schools of all grades.

IX. HUGHES'S OUTLINES OF SCRIPTURE GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.¹

THIS work is both historical and geographical in its character. In the historical portion, the author has strictly adhered to Coleman's *Historical Geography of the Bible*, a work which has been some years before the public,

¹ *Outlines of Scripture Geography and History: Illustrating the Historical Portions of the Old and New Testaments. Designed for the use of Schools and Private Reading. Based upon Coleman's Historical Geography of the Bible. By Edward Hughes, F. R. S., F. R. G. S., etc., etc. Philadelphia: Blanchard and Lea. 1854. 12mo. pp. 342.*

and in which a great amount of valuable information is condensed into a small compass. In republishing the work in the United States, Messrs. Blanchard and Lea announce that they act by the permission of Dr. Coleman.

To those who are familiar with Coleman's *Historical Geography*, it is unnecessary to say, that the present work is arranged in successive periods: the Antediluvian, the period from the Deluge to the Call of Abraham, from the Call of Abraham to the Descent into Egypt, Egypt, etc. The geographical features of each country come up for consideration, and are discussed in connection with the history of God's chosen people. Thus we have a condensed and comprehensive account of Egypt, in its boundaries and divisions, soil and climate, political history, and antiquities, in that part which belongs to the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt. In the same way the physical features of the Arabian desert, with an account of its most noted places, are given in connection with the ascent from Egypt to Palestine; and the geography of Palestine itself is connected with the conquest of Canaan under the guidance of Joshua.

Of the abundant materials which have been collected by modern travellers and antiquarians, our author has made a diligent and judicious use. Chapters have been added on "the Crusades," and "Modern Syria;" and the illustrative maps, twelve in number, have been carefully reduced from the large maps of Kiepert, Robinson and Wilson.

Those who are unable to command the time or the means necessary for the examination of the numerous, and often expensive, works on sacred geography, that have appeared during the present century, will find, in this manual, a great amount of valuable information compressed into a small space; and they will do well to make it the constant companion of their Biblical studies.

X. CHALYBÆUS'S HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.¹

WE are glad to see so good a translation of these lectures. The inaccuracies of expression are few in number, while the style is remarkably free from foreign idioms. The translator has succeeded in giving a faithful rendering of his author, without sacrificing that vitality of language which is commonly lost in translating thought from the German to the English tongue.

The work itself is well known in Germany, and is recognized as one of the best of the many Introductions which have been prepared to lead the inquirer to a knowledge of the recent speculative philosophy. It has the uncommon and well-nigh impossible merit, of being brief and lucid without

¹ *Historical Survey of Speculative Philosophy from Kant to Hegel; designed as an Introduction to the Opinions of the Recent Schools.* By Heinrich Moritz Chalybæus, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Kiel. Translated from the fourth edition of the German by Alfred Tulk. Andover: W. F. Draper. 1854. 12mo. pp. 397.

gaining these qualities at the expense of scientific thoroughness. Of course, the perusal of a work like this, will not render the reader versed in the systems which are described. It is what it purports to be, "a Survey," and will help the student in pursuing more thorough studies with a view to attaining a complete mastery of this difficult subject.

Of the importance of such an attainment to all educated men, and especially to educated clergymen, it ought to be unnecessary to speak. The speculative philosophy of Germany is a monument of the most original and powerful effort which the philosophic mind in modern times has put forth. If for no other reason, for this alone, the course of recent speculation in Germany is entitled to a profound attention. But, for the clergyman and theologian, a special interest is attached to this field of inquiry. Here are the armories out of which the heaviest and sharpest weapons of infidelity are drawn. Strauss and Parker are mere *inferences* from schemes of philosophising which can be refuted as soon as they are fairly and fully understood. But, for the understanding of them, a persevering and candid study is requisite. The means for such a study to those who do not read the works of German writers in their own language, have been heretofore wanting. It is gratifying to know that this deficiency is to be supplied.

XI. SCHMITZ'S ADVANCED LATIN EXERCISES.¹

THIS is one of the numbers of Schmitz and Zumpt's Classical Series. It consists of Progressive Exercises, English to be turned into Latin alternating with Latin to be turned into English; the whole arranged with reference to Schmitz's abridgment of Zumpt's Latin Grammar. After the Ollendorff mania, which has prevailed in some parts of this country for a few years past, it is gratifying to see a return to order and system; to a recognition of the fact, that language is not an arbitrary conglomeration of disconnected details, but an organic whole, bound together by laws of internal necessity. The grammars and exercise-books made on the Ollendorff plan are of doubtful utility, even when employed for the practical acquisition of a modern language. Applied to the ancient languages they are worse than useless; they defeat the very purposes for which those languages are studied.

The examples presented in this collection are in part taken from the exercise books of Krebs and Dronke, in part immediately from the works of Cicero. The American publishers have employed a competent editor to make such changes in the body of the work as should be necessary to adapt it to the wants of the American public. As the changes made consist entirely in additions, the purchaser of the American edition need not fear that he is using a garbled copy of the original. A large part of these additions is made up of the quotations from Schmitz's Grammar; the rule to be exemplified being in the American edition given in full, while in the Edinburgh

¹ Advanced Latin Exercises, with Selection for Reading. American edition, Revised, with Additions. Philadelphia: Blanchard and Lea. 1854.

original the appropriate paragraph in the grammar is merely referred to. The American editor seems to have apprehended that these exercises may be used without the grammar, and has, accordingly, thus adapted it to all grammars. It may be questioned, however, whether the exercises may be as satisfactorily used without the grammar, as with it.

A more important part of the additions made by the American editor, is the collection of rules for the position of words, prefixed to the work. These directions are taken mainly from Zumpt and Madvig, but the examples which illustrate them, have been collected by the editor, with few exceptions, from Cicero and Caesar. But the main advantage this edition has over the original is, in the rules for the use of the infinitive, which are at once philosophical and practical.

The demand for such works as Krebs's Guide and Schmitz's Exercises is a good sign. If these books are thoroughly studied at school under competent teachers, our college education will not long remain what it is.

ARTICLE IX.

SELECT THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GREECE.

The Rizarion Theological School, Athens, Greece.

GEORGE RIZARI was a wealthy Greek merchant, born in Albania. After residing many years in Odessa, where he accumulated a large fortune, he came to Athens in the year 1837, and died in that city, June 1, 1841. The value of the property left by him was estimated, at the end of the year 1851, at \$175,000.

A large portion of his estate was devoted, by his will, to the establishment of a Theological School in Athens. At the end of ten years from his death, or at the close of 1851, there remained, after paying legacies to the amount of more than \$13,000, and erecting buildings at the cost of \$11,500, besides meeting the current expenses of the school, a surplus of income over expenditures, of more than \$20,000.

This institution is placed under the supervision of the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs. A Director is appointed by the crown, who has the general oversight of the discipline. He must be a priest, and must reside in the institution. The number of professors must not exceed six; nor must their stipends exceed \$400 per annum. In case any of the professors should be

at the same time professors in the University of Otho, their stipends must not exceed the *half* of the above sum. The course of study extends to five years. It was the wish of the testator that a Royal Ordinance should be obtained, *requiring* every candidate for ordination to present a diploma from this institution. But it is not likely that the institution will ever secure this *monopoly* of theological education.

Candidates for admission to this institution must come under obligation to devote their lives to the priesthood. They must not be under fifteen, nor over eighteen years of age. They must reside in the institution, and live in common. Twenty beneficiaries, ten from free Greece, and ten from the founder's native district, receive \$80 per annum from the foundation. Those who are not of this number pay \$100 per annum.

The following is the Schedule of the Course of Study.

<i>First Year.</i>		<i>Hours per week.</i>
1. Greek Grammar,	.	4
Plutarch, Xenophon, Epictetus, Chrysostom,	.	6—10
2. Latin Grammar,	.	5
3. Geography, General and Sacred,	.	2
4. Sacred History — Old and New Testament,	.	2
5. Arithmetic,	.	3
6. Church Music, ¹	.	4
		26

<i>Second Year.</i>		
1. Greek Grammar, Syntax,	.	4
Xenophon, Plutarch, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil,	.	6—10
2. Latin. Caesar, Sallust, Lactantius,	.	5
3. Catechism,	.	3
4. Ancient History,	.	3
5. Political Geography of Europe, especially of Greece,	.	3
6. Algebra,	.	3
7. Church Music,	.	3
		30

<i>Third Year.</i>		
1. Greek Syntax and Composition,	.	4
Isocrates, Demosthenes, Aeschines, Plato, Herodotus, Pythagoras, and Christian Fathers,	.	8—12
2. Oratory, Secular and Sacred,	.	2
3. Latin. Cicero, Livy, Augustine,	.	5
4. General Geography,	.	2
5. Geometry,	.	3
6. General History,	.	3
7. Christian Ethics,	.	2
8. Church Music,	.	3
(Declamation once a week)	.	
		32

¹ The Greek Church allows only *vocal* music in the churches.

Fourth Year.

1. Greek Prosody,	2
Homer, Hesiod, Callimachus, Euripides, Sophocles, Aeschylus, Pindar, Hymns of Gregory Nazianzen, and Synesius,	7
Poetic Composition,	3—12
2. Latin Poetry. Virgil, Ovid, Horace, with comparison of Latin Poetry with Greek,	6
3. Plane Trigonometry,	2
4. Elements of Philosophy,	4
5. Church History,	2 or 3
6. Church Music,	3
7. Introduction to the Scriptures,	2
(Declamation of select passages from Greek poets)	31 or 32

Fifth Year.

1. Church History,	2
2. Hermeneutics,	4
3. Dogmatic Theology,	4
4. Pastoral Duties and Canonical Law,	3
5. Patristic Literature,	3
6. Church Music,	4
	20

During this year attention is also given to the composition of sermons.

There are two examinations in the course of the year; the first, on the last week in Lent, before the instructors only, followed by one week's vacation; the second, on the last week in June, public, and followed by a vacation till the twenty-fifth of August.

Those students who wish, are at liberty to remain in the institution, and pursue their studies privately, during the vacation.

The present number of students is about thirty-five.

Statistics of the University of Otho, for the Academic year 1853-4.

Whole number of students, 590. From Free Greece, 281; from abroad, 309. These are distributed as follows: In the Medical department, 305; Law, 147; Philosophical, 88; Theological, 17.

The great preponderance of medical students is in a great degree accounted for by the fact, that, throughout European Turkey, the medical profession enjoys peculiar social consideration, and is peculiarly remunerative. Hence, nearly all the students from abroad are found in that department. The following table will show the progress of the university, in respect to numbers, since it went into operation in 1838:

1839	52	1844	252	1847	270	1850	397	1852	496
1841	159	1845	172	1848	305	1851	397	1853	590
1843	142	1846	228	1849	347				

The Library has been increased during the year by donations to the amount of 5601 volumes.

GERMANY.

THE appearance of Vol. I. of a new edition of Hengstenberg's *Christology* is noticed in connection with our English intelligence.

The first No. of Neumann's *Commentary on Jeremiah* is just published.

Vol. VII. of Olshausen's *Commentary* contains Ebrard's *Exposition of the Apocalypse*, and Vol. VI. Part 1, Wiesinger's *Commentary on the Epistle of James*. A fourth edition of Vol. I. has also been published, revised by Ebrard.

Part 15 of the "*Kurzgefasstes Exeg. Handbuch zum A. T.*" contains Bertheau on the Books of Chronicles.

Prof. Hupfeld of Halle has prepared and published, in a separate volume, the articles written by him last year for Müller's "*Deutsche Zeitschrift*," on "The sources of Genesis, and the method of their connection."

Dr. E. Meier publishes a translation and commentary, with a revised text, of Solomon's Song.

A second thoroughly revised edition of Vol. I. of Kurtz's "*Geschichte des alten Bundes*," is just out; and a second edition of Tischendorf's *Synopsis Evangelica*; also a fourth edition of Hase's *Life of Christ*.

Meyer's *Commentary on Romans* (being Part 4 of his general commentary) has just appeared in a second edition.

Dr. A. Dillmann of Tübingen has published a translation, with notes, of the Book of Enoch, of which he published an edition of the Aethiopic text in 1851. He is also editing the Aethiopic version of the Old Testament. Fasc. 1 contains Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus, with the critical apparatus.

Tischendorf has lately edited the *Codex Amiantinus*, containing Jerome's version of the New Testament.

Umbreit has just published a little work entitled "*Sin, a contribution to the Theology of the Old Testament.*"

A second edition of Vol. III. of Ewald's *History of the People of Israel* is just out.

Ewald's *Jahrbuch* for 1852-3 is as spicy as usual.

Part 1 of Vol. II. of Hoffmann's "*Schriftbeweis*" has just appeared.

We have from Dr. G. Richers a "*History of the Creation, Paradise and the Deluge, as given in Gen. i.—ix.*"

The "*Biblical Theology of the New Testament*," recently edited by Weizsäcker, is the work of the late Prof. C. F. Schmidt, not of H. Schmid of Erlangen, as was erroneously stated in a late No. of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

Vol. I. of "*The Central Doctrines of Protestantism, as developed within the Reformed Church*," by Dr. A. Schweizer, embraces the 16th century.

We are glad to see that Sec. 1 of the second Part of the new edition of Dörner's "*History of the development of the doctrine of the Person of Christ*," has at length appeared.

Vol. I. of a "*History of Protestant Dogmatics in its connection with Theology in general*," is just published, edited by Dr. W. Gass.

Two new works recently published in the department of Symbolical Theology are A. H. Baier's "*Symbolik der Christlichen Confessionen und Religionspartheien*," Vol. I. Part 1 (presenting the idea and principles of Roman Catholicism); and K. Matthes' "*Comparative Symbolik aller Christlichen Confessionen*."

A new edition of Müller's Symbolical books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church is just out.

A second edition of Meier's *Manual of the History of Doctrines* is prepared by G. Baur.

Vol. I. of the third edition of Kurtz's *Manual of Church History* is now complete.

Vol. II. Parts 1 and 2 have appeared in continuation of J. P. Lange's *Church History*; the Apostolical period is still the subject.

After the lapse of nearly five years, another part (Vol. II. Part 2) of Böhlinger's valuable "*Church of Christ and its Witnesses*," has appeared.

Bunsen's *Hippolytus* has called out from Dr. Döllinger, one of the ablest Catholic theologians in Germany, "*Hippolytus and Callistus: or the Romish Church in the first half of the third century; with reference to the works and treatises of Bunsen, Wordsworth, Baur and Gieseler*."

An edition of the Greek text of the Apostolical Constitutions has been published, with preface, notes and indexes, by G. Ueltzen.

Oehler's *Tertullian* is completed by the publication of Vol. II., which contains his polemical and dogmatical writings.

Vol. II. of Thilo's *Bibliotheca Patrum Graecorum dogmatica* contains selections from Basil and Gregory of Nazianzen, edited by Goldhorn.

Harless's *Christian Ethics* has just appeared in a fifth edition.

We see announced a German translation of I. da Costa's "*Israel and the nations, — a survey of the History of the Jews to the present time*," Books 1 and 2.

Vol. II. of Dr. Kuno Fischer's *History of Modern Philosophy*, treating of the classical period of Dogmatic Philosophy, is now complete.

Vol. I. of Weigelt's "*History of Modern Philosophy in Popular Lectures*," notices Kant, J. G. Fichte, Jacobi and Schopenhauer.

Dr. Frauenstädt publishes "*Letters on Schopenhauer's Philosophy*."

Part II. Section 2, of Fichte's *System of Ethics*, has just been published; also a treatise on Psychology by Dr. L. George, and one on the Philosophy of Plotinus by Kirchner. We see announced, also, a pamphlet by Trendelenburg on Herbart's *Metaphysics*.

Prof. von Lancizolle of Berlin publishes "*Ideas, Reflections and Considerations from Schleiermacher's Works*."

Vol. II. of Baron von Reichlin-Meldegg's "*H. E. G. Paulus and his times*" is just out; also Vol. I. of Henke's "*George Calixt and his times*."

Heft 3 of Sect. 2 of Part III. of Vischer's "*Aesthetics or the Science of the Beautiful*," discusses Painting.

A new edition of Luther's Works, by Dr. K. Zimmermann, in twelve volumes, is announced; to be completed in six years.

Braun's "Griechische Götterlehre" has just been completed.

Vol. II. of Duncker's History of Antiquity is out.

Of Marquardt's Continuation of Bekker's "Manual of Roman Antiquities," Part III. Sec. 2 has just appeared.

Schwegler's Roman History is continued by the publication of Sec. 2 of Vol. I.

Part 1 of Hagen's "Investigations into Roman History," discusses Catiline.

Vol. I. of Grimm's German Lexicon is complete. The volume contains eight parts, and the last article is "Biermolke." The concluding number has furnished the preface, a register of authorities, and a likeness of the brothers Grimm, engraved on steel.

Part 1 of Gerhard's "Greek Mythology" is just out; also Part 1 of a Bibliotheca Tamulica, edited by Graul.

Another volume (pp. 1115) has been added to von Hammer Purgstall's Literary History of the Arabs.

We see announced, from F. Jacobs, "Hellas: Lectures on the Home, History, Literature and Art of the Hellenes;" from Ranke, Vol. II. of his "French History, chiefly in the 16th and 17th centuries;" from J. von Gumpach, an "Outline of Babylonian Assyrian History from the beginning of the 25th century to the latter half of the 6th century B. C.," Maj. Rawlinson's sketch being made the basis of the work; and from Pott, a curious linguistic investigation into "Personal names, and especially family names, and the mode of their origin; reference being had also to names of places."

Part 2 of Lübker's "Reallexicon des Classischen Alterthums," is just published.

Another number of the new edition of Passow's Lexicon carries down the work to *συνεδοπαπιάω*.

Vol. I. Part 1 of Georges's Manual of Classical Latinity is published (pp. viii. 884).

Dr. M. A. Uhlemann has published a work on the famous Rosetta inscription, revising the hieroglyphic inscription, giving a Latin version and explanation and glossary, etc.

Among recent editions of classical authors we notice: Merkel and Keil's Argonautica of Apollonius, Part 1; Kempf's Valerius Maximus; Vol. III. of Bekker's Diodorus Siculus; Klotz's Cicero, Vol. I. of Part III.; Jacobs and Rost's Bibl. Graeca, B. X. 3, containing Xenophon's Hellenica, edited by Breitenbach; Vol. X. of Köchly's "Corpus Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum;" the concluding Fasc. of Theodore Bergk's Poetae lyrici Graeci, in a new edition, from which he has made a selection for schools, "Anthologia lyrica;" Imman. Bekker's Lucian; Vol. IV. of Sintenis's Plutarch; Vol. III. of Kritz's Sallust; a new edition of Günther's admirable translation of Horace; and Vol. I. of Schubart's Pausanias.

A valuable contribution to Arabic literature is Mehren's "Rhetorik der Araber," with copious illustrative extracts and discussions in literary history.

Benfey's Manual of Sanskrit is completed by the publication of Vol. II. 2, containing the Glossary.

It is said that Tischendorf, during his late tour in Egypt, from which he returned in May of last year, succeeded in procuring no less than *seven* Greek manuscripts of parts of the Bible; three containing parts of the Old Testament, and four, parts of the New. He also met with some fragments of an Arabic manuscript containing a part of some of Paul's Epistles. The manuscript dates back at least to the eighth century.

The last No. of the *Studien und Kritiken* contains a notice of the Program of the Hague Society for the Defence of the Christian Religion. Among the topics recently and still proposed for prize essays, there are some of peculiar interest to us. The subject of the last prize essay is "An historical inquiry into the Character and Origin of the Presbyterian System in the Reformed Church, concerning the extension, restriction or modification which it has experienced in different lands, and the influence which it exerts at our time in the Protestant Church." The essayist was Dr. G. V. Lechler. Among the subjects still open when the Program was issued, were the following: a treatise on the nature, history and value of the Biblical Cosmogony; the origin and value of the different collections and revisions of the Epistles of Ignatius; a history of the Presbyterian Synodal System in the Reformed Church of the Netherlands; a history of Ecclesiastical Independency, its origin, working and various forms, both before and since the Reformation; the views of Arius and his followers concerning the person of Christ, the forms of their doctrine in modern times, together with an impartial exegetical and dogmatical examination of the doctrine; Paul's doctrine of Justification; the appearance of the Son of God in the Old Testament; and several others of like importance. This honored Society continues to be watchful over all the interests of the church and of Christian science. We shall be glad to see worthy prize essays on many of the subjects which they propose for discussion.

GREAT BRITAIN.

THE scholars of England have been much interested in the Essay "On the Plurality of Worlds," maintaining the doctrine that our earth is the only inhabited world in the universe; a doctrine liable to serious objection. The ability and scientific knowledge displayed in the book are striking; but the conclusion which it aims to establish is one that is wholly improbable. Very generally the author is said to be the Rev. Dr. Whewell of Cambridge. This work has been republished in Boston, with an Introduction by President Hitchcock. A reply, by Sir David Brewster, has just appeared.

Guizot's *History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth*, in two volumes, octavo, has been before the public for a little time, and amply supports the reputation of the author. It is a calm, impartial, philosophically written book. We are glad to see that, while the author does justice to Cromwell, he is not blind to his defects, as Carlyle, D'Aubigne, and more of that school are, who load the Protector with indiscriminate eulogy.

Dean Milman has published his "History of Latin Christianity, including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicholas the Fifth," in three volumes,

octavo. We suppose that this is meant to be a continuation of his History of Christianity, published many years ago. The three volumes now published do not complete what the writer has undertaken. The importance of the subject, as well as the learning and talents of the author, justify an extended notice of the book. But for such we have not room now.

The Messrs. Bagster have published "Arabic Reading Lessons with complete Analysis and Grammar," in small octavo; one of a series of manuals for learners, all of which are well executed.

The Rev. R. Knight has just published a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in an octavo volume, but we have had no time to examine it. It professes to be thoroughly and critically done.

The Remains of Bishop Copleston, with reminiscences of his life by Archbishop Whately, in an octavo volume, will find but a limited circle of readers. There is little in them worth publishing. It would appear, however, from the reminiscences, that the bishop was an amiable and accomplished man.

"First lines of Christian Theology," by the late Dr. Pye Smith, in one octavo volume, have just appeared. This is a large text-book, which the author made use of in his class, containing outlines of a course of systematic theology. There is nothing new in the work; nor can it be said that the writer was in advance of his day. It contains the old theology, in the old dress for the most part. There are many references to books under each head, but these do not bring up the subjects to the latest times. On the whole, these *lines* are behind the day. Nor has the editor improved them much by additions. To have *materially* improved them, their substance and form must have been considerably altered; for the old and valuable doctrines explained in them are now better understood, and are capable of being both philosophically and Scripturally set forth in the light of new investigations. They are not presented here in the best manner. Even the Trinity is unsatisfactorily discussed. There are not a few statements in the book, also, which we regard as incorrect.

The Religious Tract Society have published a "Handbook to the Bible," in a small volume, full of small type. We do not see what end is intended to be gained by such a volume. It is a very poor compilation. The writer did not even know the best sources to apply to for information. This same Society has not been latterly as careful in its books as it ought to be. Not a few of the small monthly volumes published by it are miserably executed.

"The New Testament in Greek, based on the text of Scholz, with English Notes and Prefaces; a Synopsis of the Four Gospels; and Chronological Tables illustrating the Gospel Narrative, by the Rev. J. F. Macmichael, B. A." The text is bad; the notes and prefaces worthless; the synopsis of the four gospels without value; and the chronological tables undeserving of the name.

"The Theological Essays of Mr. Maurice examined by R. S. Candlish, D. D." in one volume. The writer does not set out from the same point of view as Maurice. He looks at the doctrines of the Bible with the spectacles of a one-sided theology. He does not understand Maurice's point of view.

He is too objective for that. Maurice's *Essays* are in many things unsound and unscriptural; Candlish's reply is narrow and dogmatic, and in many points unscriptural too.

A small and cheap edition of the Evangelical Alliance Prize Essay on Infidelity has been published. This work, which appeared a short time ago, professes to discuss the aspects, causes and agencies of Infidelity. The author is Rev. T. Pearson. But the subject is imperfectly treated. The writer has a limited acquaintance with books, and a feeble conception of his theme. Infidelity will receive no damage by such a publication; neither will an intelligent apprehension of Divine truth be greatly promoted by it.

Akin to this, but even inferior to it, is the *Warrant of Faith*, a Handbook to the Canon and Inspiration of the Scriptures, by the Rev. R. Whytehead, M. A. Nothing can be more feeble and unsatisfactory on so great a subject. The writer is quite ignorant of the literature of the theme he takes in hand; and his ideas are crude, narrow and untenable.

The Rev. F. D. Maurice has published an octavo volume, entitled: *The Unity of the New Testament*, a synopsis of the first three Gospels, and of the Epistles of James, Jude, Peter and Paul. Mr. Maurice publishes nothing that is not worth reading, for he is a reflecting and philosophical theologian. But it is questionable whether he has thrown any new light on the New Testament in the present volume. He writes too much to do justice to himself or the themes he handles.

A series of the *British Poets*, annotated by Charles Bell, has recently commenced in monthly volumes. The editorship has not hitherto proved satisfactory; and the scheme will probably prove unsuccessful. A similar series, edited by Rev. George Gilfillan, and commenced a year ago, is superior in all respects.

Dr. William Smith's *School History of Greece* has appeared. It is the best of the size that we have; and must, in a great measure, supersede all others, even that of Dr. Schmitz. This has been republished in Boston.

Vol. III. of *Sacred Annals*, by George Smith, F. A. S., is published, in two parts. The first volume contains the Patriarchal age, to the death of Isaac; the second, the Hebrew people, to the time of Christ; and the present or concluding volume is occupied with the Gentile nations. The work shows reading and research, but is very different in critical power from Ewald's *Geschichte*, which, we are glad to learn, is to be translated into English by Dr. John Nicholson, a most competent scholar, and a personal friend, too, of Ewald.

A *History of the Christian Church to the Pontificate of Gregory the Great*, intended for general readers as well as for students in theology, by Rev. James C. Robertson, M. A., in one volume, octavo. We do not see the end intended to be answered by this publication. To the scholar it is of no use; to the general reader, Milnor is more acceptable; and to the student in theology, we should not recommend it. The author's researches have neither been deep nor extensive, as one can soon infer from the judgment occasionally given.

A valuable work has recently come from the press: *The Institutes of Justinian*, a new edition, with English Introduction, Translation and Notes, by Thomas C. Sandars, M. A. 8vo.

Dr. Whewell, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, has also edited *Grotius De Jure Belli et Pacis*, accompanied by an abridged translation of the text; with the notes of Barbeyrac, the author, and others. 3 vols. 8vo.

The Geological Observer, by Sir Henry de la Beche, appears in a second revised edition, octavo. This is a very valuable work on geology.

Not long since appeared, *Phraseological and Explanatory notes on the Hebrew text of the Book of Genesis*, by T. Preston, M. A., Trinity College, Cambridge. This is a good book; the writer being by far the best oriental scholar belonging to the University of Cambridge.

A treatise on the Episcopate of the Ante Nicene Church, by Rev. George M. Gorham, B. A., has appeared. It proposes to have special reference to the early position of the Roman See, and is comparatively small in size. Some account of it may be given in a future number.

Messrs. T. and T. Clark of Edinburgh have published a new work entitled: *The Symmetrical Structure of Scripture; or Scripture Parallelism exemplified in an Analysis of the Decalogue, the Sermon on the Mount, etc.* By the Rev. John Forbes, M. A., LL. D. Dr. F. is Head Master of a large charitable institution for the education of boys, in Edinburgh, called Donaldson's Hospital, and is known as a profound and accurate scholar. He has brought much learning, both oriental and occidental, to bear in this volume on the subject of the parallelisms of Scripture.

From the same publishers we have Vol. I. of the second edition of Hengstenberg's *Christology*, with which the new series of Clark's *Theological Library* commences; and, in the former series, Vol. IV. of Gieseler's *Church History*. Prof. Hengstenberg's important work appears almost simultaneously in England and Germany, sheets of the German work having been furnished the translator in advance of publication.

In Philosophy, the only work of much interest that has recently appeared is, *Elements of Political Science in Two Books* (Book I. On Method; Book II. On Doctrine), by Patrick Edward Dove, Esq., Author of *The Theory of Human Progression*, etc. Like his former work, this new production of Mr. Dove is characterized by much bold and original thinking; it is written with great clearness and vigor; and is strikingly suggestive, as well as full of important principles and conclusions.

The following are announced as in preparation, or in the press:

History of the Papacy, from the earliest period to the Reformation, in octavo, by the Rev. J. E. Riddle.

History of the various denominations of the Christian world from the earliest ages of the Church, by the Rev. J. B. Marsden, in octavo.

Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.

A History of the Roman Republic from the close of the second Punic war to the death of Sylla, by H. G. Liddell, M. A., two volumes, octavo.

Synonyms of the Greek Testament, by Prof. Trench of King's College.

The Messrs. Bagster have in press a new edition of the Hebrew Bible, with the most important various readings placed at the bottom of the pages, and a revised text founded on authority. All departures from Van der Hooght are marked by a smaller character in the text, after the manner of Griesbach in his Greek Testament; and the work is intended to be for the Old Testament text something like Griesbach's for the New. No pains have been spared by the editor to make it accurate and trustworthy. He has consulted and used the best authorities and works that could contribute to the value of the edition.

The press now teems with books relating to Turkey and Russia, for the war is of all-absorbing interest in England at present. There is little taste for other reading among the great majority of the people. Hence, probably, some valuable works will be postponed till the autumn or winter.

The revised edition of the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana* is very much improved. Among the new volumes just announced are: Vol. 28. *History of Greek and Roman Philosophy and Science*, by Bishop Bloomfield, Dr. Whewell, and others; Vol. 28. *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy of the first six centuries of the Christian Era*, by F. D. Maurice, from whom another volume is promised on the *Philosophy of the Middle Ages*. Another volume promised in the series is on "Glossology, or the Historical Relation of Languages," by Sir John Stoddart, LL. D., who prepared Vol. II. of the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana* on Universal Grammar. Westmacott, the eminent artist, is to furnish a volume on Sculpture.

"The Biography of Samson, illustrated and applied," is a work recently from the pen of Rev. John Bruce, D. D., of the Scotch Free Church, Edinburgh.

Prof. Henry Rogers has published a "Defence of the Eclipse of Faith," particularly against the attacks of Newman and his friends. It has been republished by Crosby and Nichols, Boston.

Major A. Cunningham has recently prepared a work on "The Bhilsa Topes, or Buddhist monuments of Central India," which is said to contain much valuable information concerning Buddhism.

Hardwick's *Church History of the Middle Ages* is illustrated by four maps prepared by A. K. Johnston (whose high reputation authorizes us to expect rare correctness), and is pronounced a very successful work.

A third edition brings Brown's "History of the Propagation of Christianity among the heathen since the Reformation," down to the present time.

Dr. Robert Vaughan has lately prepared a very elaborate and learned Monograph on John de Wyclif.

The "History of the French Protestant Refugees," by Prof. C. Weiss, and the "History of the Protestant Church in Hungary," translated by J. Craig, D. D., have recently appeared in England, and have been very promptly republished in Boston.

It is said that Mr. Scott, who was associated with Mr. Liddell in preparing the admirable and popular Greek Lexicon, has in preparation a New Testament Lexicon.

Dr. William Freund, who now resides in England, is preparing an edition of the Greek and Latin Classics for schools. The text will be in every case revised by the editor. In doubtful cases he gives the matured results of his own careful and critical inquiries. The lives of the authors, prefixed to each volume, offer the results of sound historical criticism, and point out briefly the characteristics of each author. The notes, indispensable to enable the pupil to comprehend the literary meaning of the text, are to be placed under it; more elaborate and critical notes will be published in a separate form. Each work will contain a complete vocabulary of proper names. There will be a most accurate and scrupulous revision of the press by the editor personally. Virgil has already appeared. The series will contain Horace, Cicero, Sallust, Livy, Ovid, Caesar, Homer, Xenophon, etc. Dr. Freund has also in preparation an English School Edition of his Latin Dictionary.

A third edition of Thomson's "Outline of the necessary laws of thought," is just published. The author has also prepared a work on "The Atoning work of Christ," being a course of Bampton lectures, illustrated by numerous notes.

Chapman's Quarterly Series for 1854 will consist of translations of Cousin's Lectures on the Philosophy of Kant, Feuerbach's Essence of Christianity, and Ewald's Introduction to the History of the People of Israel, with additions and emendations for this edition, and R. W. Mackay's Sketch of the Rise and Progress of Christianity.

Birks's "Horae Evangelicae, or the Internal Evidence of the Gospel History" has been recently published.

We see announced, also, Dr. J. H. Newman's Lectures on the History of the Turks in its Relation to Christianity; and two different translations of the famous "Theologia deutsch" of the fourteenth century, one under the title "Old German Theology one hundred years before the Reformation, with a preface by Martin Luther," by Mrs. Malcolm, and the other, "Theologia Germanica, etc.," by Susanna Winkworth, with a preface by Kingaley and a letter from Chevalier Bunsen.

We announced the appearance of the "Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology" in our last number. The contents of the first number of the Journal are as follows: On the Birds of Aristophanes; on Lucretius; St. Paul and Philo; a passage in 1 Cor., illustrated from Philo Judaeus; on the Dating of Ancient History; Notes on the Study of the Bible among our Forefathers. Under the department to be designated *Adversaria*, is Value of Roman Money; Classical Illustrations of St. Matthew's Gospel. Under the department of *Anecdota*, are Inscriptions; Bp. Pearson's Marginalia on Eusebius; Fragment of Cicero De Fato. Then Reviews, Shorter Notices of Books, Correspondence, Contents of Foreign Journals, Lists of New Books:

The work is one of a high order. The subjects treated show critical and extensive learning, a breadth and thoroughness of investigation which give promise that the Journal will do valuable service in the cause of Philology. The second number has appeared and is ready for delivery by the American Agent, W. F. Draper.

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA,
NO. XLIV.
AND
AMERICAN BIBLICAL REPOSITORY,
NO. XCVI.

OCTOBER, 1854.

ARTICLE I.

NOTES OF A TOUR FROM DAMASCUS TO BA'ALBEK AND
HUMS.

WITH TOPOGRAPHICAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE NORTHERN SECTION OF
ANTILEBANON.

By Rev. J. L. Porter, Missionary at Damascus.

DURING the early part of the present summer (1853), I had intended making a mission tour to the town of Hums, and the Jacobite villages around it; but was prevented from fulfilling my purpose by the pressure of duties in this city. A short interval of leisure occurred after our return from our summer residence at Blûdân; and Mr. Barnett and myself resolved to employ this time in visiting the Christians of Hums, by some of whom our presence and instructions were earnestly sought. We proposed to include in our tour such Christian villages as lay in the line of our route; and, that as large a number as possible might be embraced without waste of time, we determined to cross the mountains direct to Ba'albek, and follow the road by Râs, Hurmûl and Ribleh; and then return, if possible, by way of Sûdâd; or, if that should prove impracticable, by the great caravan road to Hasya and Nebk. This latter was the road we were finally obliged to follow.

Tuesday, October 11th. We left Bâb Tûma (Thomas' Gate) at 12 o'clock, and, after half an hour's ride in a northerly direction

among the gardens and orchards of Damascus, we crossed the canal Yezid and entered the open plain beyond. At 1 o'clock we passed through the large village of Burzeh, at the entrance of the wild ravine of Ma'raba. Twelve minutes beyond, we commenced to ascend the low ridge of barren hills that here bounds the plain. We followed the course of an ancient road, now passing through deep cuttings in the white chalky cliffs, and now scrambling up long flights of stairs hewn in the hard limestone. At 1.40 we gained the summit; and here again I enjoyed a prospect which for richness and beauty is not surpassed, if equalled, in Syria. The scene was the same I had gazed on exactly twelve months before; but many of its features had become more familiar to me by visits paid them during the interval. The group of the Tellûl was there on the eastern horizon; but I could now distinguish along their base the dim outlines of the three singular ruins called the Diâra. Far away, south by east, were the mountains of Haurân; and I could now distinctly recognize the lofty conical peaks of Kuleib and Tell Abn-Tumeis, overtopping all others; while, in the plain to the north of this range, I could see the ruin-crowned Tell el-Khale-diyeh. The bearings of these I noted, testing the accuracy of the compass by measuring their relative angles with the sextant. These bearings are important as determining the relative positions of the city and plain of Damascus, and the mountain range of the Haurân.

From this spot we descended the hill diagonally in a course N. 20 W., and in fourteen minutes reached the plain of Sahra. We then turned N. 25 E., leaving the large village of Tell, with its luxuriant orchards and vineyards, some distance to the left. In half an hour more we left the road we had followed in our former journey to Saidanâya, that we might keep further along the Sahra, and obtain a view of its north-eastern extremity to the foot of Jebel Tiniyeh. The ground was now undulating, the spurs from the two ranges on the right and left here meeting and interlacing. Our course was north-east; and, after some time, on surmounting a rising ground, we got a fine view of this section of the Sahra. It is considerably depressed, and a large portion of it is cultivated. In one hour more we reached the summit of the second ridge of hills, which is at this place much lower than at the point where we crossed it on our former journey. It retains, however, the same characteristic features

towards the south-east — a shelving slope surmounted by a lofty wall of naked rock. The road is ancient, and is hewn deeply in the cliff. We observed a little further eastward a large excavated chamber, now used as a chapel, and dedicated to some saint. On reaching the summit, I saw, at twenty minutes distance, in the plain below, the little village of Ma'râneh; and about forty minutes N. by E., Hafeiyer. These are the only villages eastward of Tell, in the plain of Sahra. The general aspect of this region during the autumn is bleak and desolate in the extreme. The mountain sides are either naked white rock, or loose gravel composed of fragments of flint and limestone. The plains, as seen from the distance, are no less barren looking than the mountain sides. Not a tree or shrub or particle of verdure relieves the painful whiteness of the parched soil; save, here and there, where an ancient olive or a half-decayed mulberry stands lonely and deserted, like the last tree of the forest; or where a little group of walnut and poplar trees clusters round a fountain in some secluded dell. The land, however, is not so barren as it seems. Vines grow luxuriantly where the hand of industry plants and tends them; and the blasted looking soil yields a crop of wheat or barley which amply repays the labor of the peasant. Even here, there are extensive vineyards; but it requires a close examination to identify them at this season; for no sooner is the fruit removed, than vast flocks of hungry goats are turned loose among them, and then soon divest them of every leaf, and tendril, and sappy branch. The expense and trouble of pruning is thus saved, and the poor goats are kept from starvation.

The battlemented cliffs of Saidanâya were now before us, on the side of the opposite rugged mountain range; and the gardens of Ma'arra, about half way to it, lay a little to the right in the plain below. We descended the easy slope, through fine fields, and reached Ma'arra in half an hour. From this we rode across the fertile plain among extensive vineyards to the foot of the opposite hills, where a few minutes ascent brought us to the base of the rock on which stands the convent of Saidanâya, thirty minutes from the former village.

The date of the foundation of this convent I am unable to ascertain from any good authority. One of the officiating priests told me it was erected 1340 years ago, in the time of the Emperor Justinian. It so happens, however, that Justinian did not

ascend the throne till fifteen years after that time. Maundrell also states that it was founded and endowed during the reign of this emperor. Whether this be the case or not, it is unquestionably of high antiquity; and I would suppose prior to the time of the Muhammedan conquest. Some of the excavated tombs in the sides of the rock have Greek inscriptions.

We spent the evening on the spacious terrace, in interesting conversation with some Greek Christians. This place is a favorite resort for the members of the Eastern church in the city of Damascus. Enervated by the long continued heats of summer, and wasted it may be with fever and dysentery, they wend their way to this mountain sanctuary. The fresh bracing air, and the vigorous exercise on the hill-sides, often infuse new health and vigor into the exhausted frame; and the happy change is piously ascribed to the miraculous intervention of the Virgin, the tutelary deity of the place. Forty nuns now occupy this convent. The prioress is appointed by the Greek patriarch of Damascus, and subject immediately to his jurisdiction.

Wednesday, Oct. 12th. This morning I attended the service in the church. It was the festival of Saint Gregorius; and, after various prayers to the Virgin and several elevations of the host, we were treated to a most wonderful story about Gregory himself, taken from the "Lives of the Saints." After a second glance at the works of art that adorn the walls of this building, I went to make a more minute examination of the square tower-like structure I had formerly seen. It stands on a platform composed of three tiers of large hewn stones, arranged so as to form steps all round, similar to the base of the monument at Hurmül. The building itself is a perfect square of $29\frac{1}{2}$ feet on each side, and 26 feet high. It is somewhat remarkable, that these are exactly the dimensions of the lower story of the monument referred to. The interior is vaulted, the arches resting on massive pillars of solid masonry at the corners. In the centre of one of these is a narrow winding staircase leading to the top. The whole building is simple and chaste. The stones are large and well-hewn, and the workmanship is evidently of the Roman age. It is now fitted up as a chapel, and dedicated to St. Peter. I think it probable that it was originally intended for a tomb, and that sarcophagi were laid between the heavy square columns.

We engaged a guide to conduct us over the great mountain chain to Ba'albek. This we found a work of some difficulty;

since the intervening country, and, indeed, the whole northern chain of Antilebanon, is the great stronghold of the house of Harfûsh, the hereditary Emirs of Ba'albek; and these, since the rebellion of the Metâwely in 1850, are outlawed, and rebels against the government. Several of them have been captured, some have been killed in battle, and a few caught by intrigue; but still the present head of the princely house, the Emir Sulimân, defies the government, maintains a guard of a hundred horse, and is the actual governor of the district of Ba'albek. Many of his followers live by plunder; and the flocks, and even the grain and houses of the surrounding villages, suffer from their depredations. Fortunately for us, the Emir, though outlawed by the Sultan, is a kind of English protégé, as indeed are most rébels now-a-days. We had, therefore, nothing to fear; and at last succeeded in persuading our Christian guide, that we would protect him if he would point out the way.

We left the convent at 8 o'clock, and, passing through the village, followed a path running in a north-western direction up the rocky side of Jebel Shurabîn. We first crossed a rugged spur that projects from the mountain towards the south, and descended into a deep valley parallel to it, the bottom of which we reached at 8.20. The small village of Telfita was now about half an hour on our left, on the opposite slope of a *bosom* in the mountain range, into which the Wady we had entered falls. The whole mountain sides around are cultivated in patches, between the rocks and cliffs. The ruins of several small chapels crown the lower peaks of the mountain on the right; while on its summit stands the old convent of *Mar Shurabîn*, i. e. St. Cherubim! These, I presume, are the convents with which Berghaus has so profusely ornamented his map in this place. It is scarcely necessary to state, that these, with all the villages around, are there inserted at random.

At 8.50 we reached a lofty brow from which the view was so commanding that I remained a short time to make observations. From this point I took the following bearings: Saidanâya, S. 25 E.; Jebel Tintyeh, S. 69 E.; Wely Naser above Salahtyeh, S. 17 W.; Menin, S. 29 W.; and Hermon, S. 63½ W. I was thus enabled, by connecting these with bearings formerly taken, to cover with a network of triangles the whole south-eastern portion of the Antilebanon chain; as well as the great plain at its

base. All this district, with its peaks and ridges, and valleys and plains, was now spread before me like a map.

Starting at 8.57 we reached the summit of this mountain ridge in nine minutes. The features of this place, and the formation of the ridges, are somewhat different from what I had been led to conjecture during my former visit. In the upper part of the vale of Helbôn, near the fountain, begin two lofty mountain ranges, divided by a narrow but deep and wild glen. In looking up this glen from the summit of a neighboring peak, it appeared to run away far to the north-east. The southern range of these two, I had observed to run unbroken from Helbôn to Shurabîn; and the other I had likewise observed to run unbroken towards Ma'lûla. On passing round the base of Shurabîn, on my former journey to Ma'lûla, I had seen a valley running up between these two ridges, in which is situated the village of Renkâs. I therefore naturally concluded that this was a continuation of the same valley that commenced at Helbôn. Now, however, I found that this valley is not continuous; and that the two ridges unite behind Saidanâya, and form one broad chain, bounding the highest plateau on the south-west.

We now rode down a little valley that led us in twenty minutes by a gentle descent into the broad undulating plateau; and continuing in the same course (N. 25 W.) seven minutes more, we struck the road from Telfita at the little fountain of Sureir. This is the most direct road from Damascus to Ba'albek. Its course from the city is by Burzeh through the ravine to Ma'raba; thence up the vale to Tell and Mentn, and then direct to Telfita and Jubb Sureir where we now stood. Around this place there is a considerable amount of cultivation. The soil is in general light and gravelly; but, being abundantly watered by the rains and snows of winter, it is not unproductive. The elevation of this plain I would suppose to be about 4500 feet above the sea.

Our path was now due north for twenty-two minutes. The mountains on the left were about one hour distant; and the guide pointed out to me the entrance into the deep Wady Hureiry, which runs from this plain to the village of the same name, near the banks of the Barada at Sûk. The main chain rose up before us like a huge wall. The summits are of nearly uniform elevation, from the lofty peak above Blûdân to two others of almost equal altitude in the parallel of Yabrûd and Ba'albek.

After following a course N. 25 W. for twenty minutes, we again resumed our former direction, and forty-five minutes after reached the foot of the mountains. The western part of the plateau is here stony and barren. Great numbers of prickly shrubs grow up among the rocks and loose stones; and a belt along the base of the mountain is covered with the dwarf oak and wild plum. As we rode across this plain we were somewhat surprised to see large quantities of wild flowers of every color; the crocus being the most abundant. In the spring season, the mountains, plains and valleys of this land, are everywhere carpeted with flowers of the brightest hues. Anemones, convolvulus, iris, crocus, and many other species, are seen mingled together in rich profusion; but never before had I observed so many in the autumn.

From this place, at the entrance of a little valley, we had a full view of the plateau; and could distinctly see the gorge leading into the plain of Yabrûd and Nebk, far away to the east. Its general form is rhomboidal, the acute angles being on the south-west and north-east. The long mountain chain on the south-east side runs unbroken (as seen from this place) from its commencement to the glen at Yabrûd. The mountains on the south-west are loftier but less regular in form. These cannot be regarded as a chain, but as the terminations of the broad irregular side ridges that run from the valley of the Barada to this plateau. The course of the main chain of Antilebanon is from south-west to north-east; while the terminations of these side ridges form a line running towards the other in a direction N. 30 E.

The whole of this district, including the plateau and the mountains and plain about Saidanâya, is called 'Asâl, or Jubbet 'Asâl, from the village 'Asâl el-Werd; the gardens of which we could see about two hours distant in the same line with the village and gorge of Yabrûd. About the same distance off, but more to the eastward, I could see the ruined Wely called Reish, and beyond it a quarter of an hour, the guide informed me, is the village Haush—I suppose the Haush 'Arab mentioned in Dr. Smith's lists. These I understand are the only inhabited villages in the plateau. There is a small one in ruins near the southern end, called Aukek, which gives its name to that section of the plain.

At 11.15 we again mounted and rode up the little Wady Haurât, and after crossing a low ridge entered another Wady much deeper; course N. 55 W. At 11.30 we entered a third,

after passing over a rocky ledge. The scenery now was very grand. Lofty naked cliffs crowned the rugged mountain range on the left; and the slopes on both sides were scantily covered with forests of the ilex, the wild plum, and the hawthorn. The scene was wild and desolate in the extreme. No living thing was within view, save a few eagles soaring round the jagged cliffs far above us. It is a fitting abode for the bandit and the outlaw; and one of us had just given expression to this thought, when a shrill cry from the mountain's side rung in our ears. It was answered by another from the opposite peak; but still no human being was in sight. We concluded, at once, that some of the Metawely spies were giving notice of our approach, and we deemed it necessary to be on our guard. After crossing a rising ground, a horseman, with a single attendant, was seen approaching from the tangled wood in front; and the voices of many others could be heard around. We pressed on, however; gave the ordinary salutation to the strangers; and, after crossing diagonally a broad wooded valley, we commenced the ascent of the mountain at 11.55. All the valleys here run nearly parallel to the main chain, having only a slight inclination to the east. The ridges on the south-east of us were now almost as lofty as those opposite, and their features and scenery were of the same character, being bold and rugged, and not bare and rounded like those more to the south. The whole strata was hitherto calcareous limestone; but now the sandstone appeared cropping up over it; while the oak began to give way to the pine and the juniper.

At 12.10 we reached the summit of a rocky ridge, from which the entrance of Wady Haurât bore S. 65 E. After crossing a narrow and deep ravine, we entered a little fertile plain. We were now in the very heart of the mountains. Their loftiest peaks raised their heads around us; while the deep dark glens led away down eastward, showing that the watershed was still before us. A ledge of rocks cropping up from the plain attracted my attention; its features, color and general appearance struck me at once as resembling red syenite. On riding to the spot, however, I found that it was only the top of a limestone ledge, which had been thrown up by volcanic action, and discolored at the same time. The dusky basalt appeared beside it in dense masses, while small boulders of the same rock covered this part of the plain. At 12.40 we reached the fine fountain called 'Ayûn ed-Dûra.

Here we reclined on the grassy banks of the little fountain to eat our noonday meal. Vast flocks of small birds hovered round; we had disturbed them in their favorite haunt, and they now waited impatiently till we should again leave them in quiet possession. A few hawks, however, gliding around, or poised motionless high overhead, showed that we were not the only disturbers of this little feathered throng. One or two solitary vultures were perched gloomy and sorrowful-like on neighboring cliffs; and around them eagles swept in graceful circles. This place, in fact, seems to be the chosen retreat of the whole feathered tribes that frequent these mountains. Beasts, also, have evidently visited it in no small numbers. There the wild boar has turned up the fresh turf in search of his food; and here at our feet are the broad tracks of the bear that lately stooped to drink at the bubbling fountain. Antilebanon is but thinly peopled by man; but the lower animals, both birds and beasts, inhabit it in vast numbers. The multitude of eagles is almost incredible. They may be seen every day in large flocks, sweeping gracefully round some towering cliff, or circling high in the air over their prey. On one occasion, when I had fallen asleep on one of the loftiest peaks of these mountains, I was suddenly roused by a strange sound, as if a whirlwind was sweeping through the old juniper trees around me. On looking up I saw *twenty-four* huge eagles dashing through the air, and most of them within pistol shot. Vultures are also numerous; and hawks are found in almost endless variety. A species of daw, very much resembling the jackdaw of England, frequents the higher districts. Partridges abound in every part, and snipes and woodcocks wherever there is water. Of beasts the bear is the largest. He is rather low, but long and powerfully made, and of a dull brown color. The wolf, the hyena, the jackal, and the hare, are also met with. A species of panther, I have been told, is found on Hermon; but I have never seen any of them.

At 1.15 we left the fountain, and rode up the mountain side over strata of basalt. In ten minutes we reached the summit of the great central ridge, and the water-shed. Here, as I stood looking along the line of mountains north-eastward, I had on my left the abrupt and broken descent to the valley of Ma'rabûn; from whence, more to the southward, the deep Wady Yahfûfeh cuts through a side ridge on its way to the Buk'a'a. This great plain,

level as a lake, with the towering summits of Lebanon beyond, forms a glorious picture from this elevation. On my right I could look over jagged cliffs, and broken mountains to the broad plateau of 'Asâl. The entrance of the little Wady el-Haurât was visible, bearing S. 55 E.; and this marks precisely the general line of our route from the plain to the summit. The whole scene was one of wild and stern grandeur, such as is scarcely equalled in these mountains. The steep and rugged descent on the west is deeply furrowed by rocky ravines; while on the east are mountain ridges and towering peaks, here and there covered with the oak, the pine, and the juniper. The elevation at this spot I judged, from a comparison with other places, to be about 6000 feet. It is, however, somewhat lower than the average height of this part of Antilebanon.

We now rode for a few minutes along the summit of the ridge, passing the head of a deep and fine vale that runs down eastward toward 'Asâl, and then commenced our western descent by an easy path that runs diagonally N. 10 W. The mountain summits now rose on our right, the sides having a steep but uniform slope from our path upward; while close on our left were the heads of numerous wild ravines. At 1.35 we reached a little meadow, with several small fountains; the water from which runs down a deep glen into Wady Ma'ra-bân, entering it some distance north of the village. This place is called the Merûj, and here is the highest source of the Nahr Yahfâfeh, one of the tributaries of the Litâny. Fifteen minutes after, we passed a very small fountain of pure water, called 'Ain Hil-Jerâbek. This is a favorite resort of the shepherds, who are great epicures in water. Its name is not uncommon in these mountains. It signifies "The fountain of the opening of the Knapsack." All the shepherds have a little sack of skin which they carry, strapped like a soldier's knapsack, upon their back. In this they keep their scanty fare; and, when they reach a spring of pure water, they unloose it, and eat their meals with a relish, which those alone can realize who breathe the pure mountain air, and are braced by vigorous exercise. Often have I sat beside the bubbling fountain in the midst of these simple and wild-looking shepherds of Antilebanon, and told them tales of other lands, that to them were stranger far than any story of the "Thousand and One Nights." I have seen their flocks gathered around them in one dense mass, and I

have been not a little astonished and pleased to observe that this mingling gave rise to no confusion. Each shepherd, when he has finished his repast, or when the time of rest is over, rises from his place and walks away, calling to his sheep or goats in a peculiar way, and immediately his own flock separate themselves from the throng and follow him. The other shepherds do so too, and each flock follows its own master. How beautifully illustrative of the words of our Saviour: "He calleth his own sheep by name and leadeth them out. And when he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him: for they know his voice. And a stranger will they not follow: for they know not the voice of strangers." John 10: 4, 5.

A few minutes after we passed another small fountain; and at 2.5 crossed over a high ledge of naked limestone rocks that runs down toward the Bukâ'a between two deep ravines. The mountain side on our right now rose up almost a sheer precipice. The rocks and glens around were covered with forests of the juniper and ilex. These glens were like yawning gulfs in the mountain side; their sides in many places being walls of naked white rock, which contrasts well with the sombre foliage in the depths below. After riding for a quarter of an hour in a course N. 10 E., we turned suddenly to the N. W., and rode down a difficult zigzag path toward the valley of Ma'rabûn, and reached the little fountain of Benaiyeh near the head of the Wady at 2.60. Here we spent five minutes in watering our horses, and examining the ruins of a small temple that crowns a little Tell in the middle of the valley. There is nothing remarkable about these ruins. It is somewhat singular, however, that along the road which runs from Ba'albek to Zebedâny through this valley, there are four similar structures. On one of these, below the village of Blûdân, is a fragment of a Greek inscription. Another, near Ma'rabûn, had a portico of massive columns, the shafts of which are still seen scattered over the meadow.

The country around was now quite familiar to me. I had passed this spot only a few months before, when returning from Beirût and the Cedars to Blûdân. From this fountain a good road runs down the valley to the village of Ma'rabûn in a direction nearly south-west. The little stream, gathered from the Merûj, and many other deep Wadys, falls into this valley. The village is

built on the summit of a rocky Tell at the base of the mountains, which rise up over it in beetling cliffs. At the village, the Wady is of considerable breadth, having a beautiful expanse of meadow, over which the walnut and other fruit trees are disposed in tasteful groups. From the western base of the Tell on which the village stands, copious fountains burst forth. Their united waters run down the vale, at first south-west for twenty minutes, and then gradually turning westward for twelve minutes more, sweeping along in a narrow bed, they are spanned by an ancient bridge. Just below this bridge, the stream from Sūrghāya, whose source is (S. by W.) at the village of the same name, joins that from Ma'rabūn. The rivulet thus formed enters the winding Wady Yahfūfeh, cutting its way through the lofty side range of hills; enters the Bukā'a north of the little village of Māsy; and then runs toward the centre of the plain in a course N. 82 W., passing the villages of 'Aly en-Nahry, Reyāk and Haush Hāla. The distance from 'Ain el-Benaiyeh to Ma'rabūn is one hour, forty-two minutes; thence to the bridge, thirty-two minutes; thence to Sūrghāya (S. 25 W.) twenty-eight minutes; thence to 'Ain Hauwar (S. 40 W.) forty-five minutes; and thence to Zebedāny (S. W.) one hour. The Wady Ma'rabūn, and the plains of Sūrghāya and Zebedāny, are all in one line, running along the western side of the central ridge of Antilebanon, from south-west to north-east.

At 3.15 we again started, and in fifteen minutes struck the regular road on the west side of the valley. We now crossed a low ridge which forms the water-shed between the Wady Ma'rabūn and the Wady Sibāt, and rode down a steep slope to the bottom of the latter, which we reached at 3.35. The scenery here is very grand. Lofty mountains rise up on each side, crowned with perpendicular cliffs of naked rock. The sides are covered with shattered fragments of limestone, among which spring up the wild plum and dwarf oak. Immediately above this pass, Wady Sibāt turns to the north-east, and thus, when seen from a little distance, seems to be a continuation of Wady Ma'rabūn. It continues its course making a deep furrow, or rather division, in the mountain chain to near its northern extremity. The great defect of the maps hitherto published, is, that they represent the central chain of Antilebanon as lying on the western side of the plains of Zebedāny and Sūrghāya, and running thence northward in an unbroken line. Such is far from

being the case; for the main chain is on the *east* side of those plains. The other is only a side range, which is cut through by the Wady Yahfûfeh, and then again by the Wady Sibât. At this place it may be considered as joining the great chain; for, though a deep Wady runs up between them, yet it is not so broad as to constitute them two distinct ranges. The loftiest ridge of Antilebanon is very regular in its course. A line drawn north-east by compass, from the summit of Hermon to the plain of Hums, would fall along its highest summits.

About twenty minutes above this pass is the little village of Sha'eibeh, on the brow of the hill. The Wady Sibât enters the Bukâ'a about half an hour south of the village of Bereitân. We now continued our route, skirting the cliff on our right, and gradually ascending almost at right angles to the line of the Wady, so as to pass round the basin-like depression on the western side of the pass. We followed the same course from 'Ain el-Benaiyeh till we reached the angle of this depression at 3.48; and then turned down the right bank of the Wady (N. 60 W.), and followed a winding path that led us gradually away from it over naked rocky slopes. At 4.20 we turned suddenly to the right and rode straight toward Ba'albek, N. 10 E. In twelve minutes we passed a deep ravine, that runs down past the village of Taiyibeh, and enters the Bukâ'a at the southern end of the low range of hills, that extend from Ba'albek to that village. A few minutes afterward we passed on the right of a ruined village with the foundations of a little temple or castle in the centre of it. Here are traces of an ancient road, and at several other points between this and Ma'rabûn I observed remains of it. This, I have no doubt, was in former times the line of the great thoroughfare between the cities of Ba'albek, Abila and Damascus. It is not longer than the way by Neby Shît, and it is much better and more level. There are no rocky hills to cross, and no difficult and narrow defiles to wind through. At 5.13 we had 'Ain Burday on our left; and fifteen minutes after we entered among the ruins of Ba'albek.

With the history and character of the splendid ruins that adorn this ancient city, I have here nothing to do. My object now is to delineate the geographical features of Antilebanon, and the adjoining districts; and to direct attention to such objects of interest in common with these mountains, as are but little known, or as have been but imperfectly described. — From

Ba'albek to Ribleh I give but an outline of my notes, confining myself almost exclusively to geographical features.

Thursday, Oct. 13th. We left the city at 7.40, passing over heaps of ruins near one of the ancient gates. Our course was N. 50 W., over a stony plain. In twenty-five minutes we entered among little swelling hills. I here observed, on closely examining the great chain of Antilebanon, that it is, *in this parallel*, composed of three distinct ridges divided by valleys. That on the west is lowest, and is separated from the others by the Wady Sibât, above mentioned. The central ridge here appears for the first time, rising over the former; and soon increases in altitude as it runs northward, until it becomes the main range. The eastern is the loftiest of all *toward the south*; but it decreases in altitude from this point northward. In it are three peaks, in the parallel of Ba'albek; almost equal in height to any in the whole chain. The mountains are not regular in form; and, when viewed only from the plain, the general features above referred to are not so distinctly marked, or so easily discerned. The division made in the ridge by the Wadys Ma'râbân and Sibât, I first observed from the lofty peak near Blûdân; and afterwards saw it more distinctly from the summit of the mountain at the Cedars.

At 8.15, on crossing some high ground, we turned N. 35 E.; but ten minutes after resumed our former course; and, at 8.43, dismounted beside the ruins of the old temple at Nahleh. It is beautifully situated on the southern bank of a deep ravine, in the bottom of which, just below the projecting cliff on which it stands, is a fine fountain. The glen cuts deeply into the mountains; and looks like a great fissure in this part of the plain. I here observed, on the north-east of Nahleh, a lofty mountain standing out from the main ridge, and divided from it by a deep valley, which is drained into Wady Nahleh. This I found to be the commencement of a side range that extends from this place, parallel to the other, to the extremity of the chain near Jâsieh, or more commonly Jûsy.

We left at 9.5, and after ascending the steep bank continued in our former course, skirting a stony Tell, the beginning of a low ridge that runs as far as Yûnin. In a quarter of an hour we turned gradually round its base to N. 23 E., and rode along the narrow valley between it and the southern spur of the lofty mountain above mentioned. At 9.35 I observed opposite me on

the brow of this hill, to the right, ruins composed of large hewn stones, that appeared to be the remains of some ancient structure. Seventeen minutes after, we reached Yûnin, situated on the right bank of a little glen that descends from near the summit of the mountain behind. A large stream of water flows down it, and the meadows and gardens below are in consequence covered with verdure. A little canal is conducted along its right bank, far away to the northward, to irrigate the higher portions of the plain. Deir el-Ahmar bears from this place N. 64 W.

There is an upper and more direct road from Yûnin to Lebweh; but we took that further down in the plain, in order to avoid the deep ravines and rocky spurs that here descend from the mountains. Our route was now N. 10 W. along the side of the little canal. At 10.37, forty-five minutes after leaving the village, on surmounting a rising ground, I obtained an extensive view northward, and here saw for the first time the monument of Hurmûl, far away on the horizon, bearing N. 30 E. Deir el-Ahmar bears from this spot N. 77 W.; and Sha'ad, a small village on the west side of the plain, N. 35 W. Turning N. 25 E. we now rode over a stony plain that slopes down gently to the foot of Lebanon. At 11.20 I observed, ten minutes distant on the left, a few houses on the side of a low Tell, and, further down, a verdant meadow with little groups of trees; and a few minutes after, we crossed a shallow Wady with a little stream of water, and some fields of maize. These were the only signs of cultivation on this dreary spot. At 12 o'clock we turned directly toward the village of 'Ain, now distinctly seen crowning one of the spurs of Antilebanon. A few minutes after, we crossed a deep ravine, that cuts through the side ridge of Antilebanon, and runs in a winding course across the plain to the opposite mountains. At 12.55 we reached the village of Lebweh. The ruins of the ancient city cover a little Tell in the centre of the vale, about ten minutes below the great fountain. Little now remains but heaps of rubbish, among which a broken shaft and disfigured capital are here and there seen. The foundations and lower walls of some important structure, probably a temple, still stand on the north brow of the Tell. A few miserable huts have been constructed amid the ruins by the modern inhabitants. The sides of the vale are covered with the richest vegetation, and verdant meadows and corn-fields are seen further

down, where it expands into a little plain. Two small ancient canals are led off from the fountain, one on each bank; and their waters abundantly irrigate the soil. Another canal of great size is conducted along the slope of the hill, round which it sweeps below 'Ain and Fikeh, to water the gardens and fields of Kâ'a. The river runs down the valley in a direction north by west to the foot of Lebanon, along which it winds in a deep and narrow channel to the great fountain near Hurmûl, called Neb'a el 'Asy.

At 1.15 we again mounted our horses, crossed the stream and the two canals on the right bank, and continued in a straight course to 'Ain. At 1.40 we had a small Wely, surrounded by some houses and gardens, ten minutes on our right. Ascending a gentle slope we reached the village at two o'clock. I observed some ancient tombs hewn in the rock as we approached; but these were the only evidences of antiquity I could anywhere perceive. This certainly cannot be the place mentioned in Scripture as west of Riblah; for the bearing of the latter from it is much nearer north than east. Passing through the village and its gardens, we rode on between a little range of Tells and the main range of Antilebanon; and in twenty-seven minutes reached the summit of an elevated spur that here connects them, and from it had a commanding view of the great plain far southward. 'Ain and Lebweh were in the same line bearing S. 60 W. Looking northward, there at our feet was the deep and picturesque glen on the right bank of which is built the little village of Fikeh. The bottom of this glen is filled with the dense foliage of the numerous orchards and vineyards, whose deep verdure forms a fine contrast with the white cliffs that tower over them. A steep winding path brought us in ten minutes to the gardens; through these we winded for a time, and then ascending diagonally the opposite bank, entered Fikeh in five minutes more. We now crossed another ridge, and in twenty-five minutes entered the village of Râs Ba'albek. Passing over heaps of ancient ruins, in the midst of which stands an old church with a stone roof, we went to the convent. This is situated a few hundred paces above the village, near the entrance to a sublime gorge in the mountains.

Here we took up our abode for the night. We found its only occupants to be the superior and the priest of the village. We were received with great kindness, but were not very fortunate

in the selection of our new acquaintances. In the priest we soon recognized the brother of a man, who had only a short time previously been imprisoned for breaking open and plundering Mr. Barnett's house in Damascus. The superior was evidently a shrewd man of the world, if not a very profound theologian, or an over strict moralist. After a long and rather noisy dispute with a group of villagers about a vineyard and flock of sheep which he possessed, he assailed one of our servants on the subject of religion. Here, however, he did not feel himself quite so much at home; and was far behind his antagonist in knowledge of the Scriptures. Passage after passage was quoted by Jirjis; text after text was hurled at the heads of pictures, images and saints. The poor priest, when he found the statements and commands of the Old Testament against him, thought to finish it by a *coup de main*, and so denied its authority altogether! He now appealed to the New Testament; but here it was worse and worse. When at last he was completely silenced, he jumped up in a rage and asked his opponent, if he would dare to broach his heresy within the very convent walls? His anger was soon over, however; and the disgrace of such a defeat in the presence of his parishioners seemed to affect him but little. Soon after, poor man! to supply the place of a better spirit, which he thought, I suppose, had deserted him, he pulled out his brandy bottle, and after liberal potations, lay down perfectly satisfied with himself and all the world. Such is a specimen of the ministers of God, so-called, in this unfortunate land.

Friday, Oct. 14th. Accompanied by a guide, I went forth at the earliest dawn, to ascend the Tell on the north side of the convent; and thus obtain a good panoramic view of the northern base of Antilebanon, the vale of the Orontes, and the great plain of Hama. I was amply repaid for my morning's toil, in the magnificent prospect I here enjoyed. Standing amid the crumbling ruins of an old convent, and resting my compass on the tottering wall, I took careful bearings of the many important places within the range of vision, correcting them for the sake of greater accuracy with the sextant. On my right ran the base of Antilebanon in a course N. 47 E. to the point where it finally sinks into the plain. In this line, some thirteen miles distant, I could see the towers and wide-spreading ruins of Jûsy, and about an hour below them the large village of Zerrâ'a N. 39 E. Far away on the distant horizon, the

first rays of the sun lighted up the castle hill of Hums, N. 32½ E. The lake, too, was there like a sheet of burnished gold, covering an arc of ten degrees from N. 27 E. westward; and far beyond it were the dim outlines of the Kurân Hamah, two mountains called by this name near that town. The village of Kâ'a lay in the plain an hour and a half distant (N. 34 E.); and the waters of the great canal from Lebweh covered the fields around it with verdure. And there (N. 2 E.) stood the strange monument of Hurmûl, all solitary in the midst of a desert. The range of hills which commences, as we have stated, a little to the north of Nahleh, extends to this place and continues its course to the extremity of the mountain chain. Its direction is uniform the whole way, being nearly N. E. The high spurs, however, which run out at 'Ain, Fikeh and Râs, together with the little Tells, give the mountains the appearance of bending at this point more eastward. But the fact is, that the main ridge maintains a straight course to its termination. To the south of Râs Ba'albek, the mountains are bolder and the scenery more interesting, than towards the north. Lofty peaks spring up at intervals with jagged sides, and between them are wild and deep ravines. In many places, too, they are scantily covered with forests of oak. But from Râs northward, they are bare, bleak, and completely destitute of verdure. Steep gravelly slopes run up from the desolate plain to the rounded summits.

As it was our desire this day to visit the fountain of the 'Asy, the monument of Hurmûl and the ruins of Jûsy, before proceeding for the night to Ribleh, we selected an active guide to take us by the most direct routes to the several places. We mounted our horses at 8.5, and riding over heaps of ruins, the only memorials of some ancient but forgotten city, we reached the fountain in a few minutes. We now rode through some gardens, and then emerged on the open plain. In half an hour we crossed the great canal, which runs from hence to Kâ'a, and turns several mills on its course. I saw, a little above this canal, the track of another and apparently more ancient one. The plain is here barren and stony, sloping down to the brink of the chasm, that runs along the very base of Lebanon. Our course was about N. 25 W., direct towards the great fountain, the direction of which the guide pointed out, and marked by a white path that descends to it from the mountain side opposite.

At 9.45 we reached a small ruined village on the brow of the glen, called Khirbet el-Hyât. Descending the steep bank, we arrived in ten minutes more at the side of a deep pool, in which there is a large spring. Here we dismounted, and passing round it, scrambled over a rocky ledge, and reached the brow of a conglomerate cliff, looking over which we saw the whole waters of this fine fountain bursting forth from beneath it into the bed of the little stream. The united waters did not seem to me much more copious than the Barada below Ftjeh. It is difficult, however, to judge of the volume of a river near such a fountain. The water bursts forth with such force, and flows with such rapidity, that the river is much larger in reality than it appears. The breadth of the stream is about fifteen yards; the bed is rocky, the banks on each side precipitous, and the course very tortuous. Having examined the fountain, we ascended the right bank and proceeded along it a few hundred yards, till we came near to the excavated convent of Deir Mâr Marôn. It is wholly hewn out of the solid rock of the cliff, and its rooms are said to be numerous and spacious. It was now, however, filled with sheep and goats, and several savage dogs kept guard over them, so that we did not attempt to enter. The river from Lebweh on approaching this fountain, flows nearly due north in a winding channel. The side range of Lebanon rises abruptly from the bed of the river, and is furrowed by Wadys whose sides have an easy and pretty uniform slope. These Wadys do not run at right angles to the course of the range, but descend diagonally, inclining considerably to the north-east.

At 10.20 we started from the side of the fountain, and ascending the bank, proceeded in a straight course to the monument of Hurmûl, S. 10 E. The whole plain is here undulating. A line of low swelling hills runs along parallel to the bed of the river; and on the summit of one of the highest of these stands the monument. The channel in which the 'Asy flows is here deep and tortuous. Its course across the plain cannot be seen, till one stands on the very brow of the Wady. As I approached the monument I was much disappointed in its apparent dimensions. It did not seem more than thirty feet high; and when I observed two foxes taking refuge behind some loose stones near its summit, I fancied I would soon dislodge them. But when I reached its base, and drew up my horse beneath its shadow, all disappointment vanished. I cannot account for this

strange delusion. We reached it at 11.5, exactly three quarters of an hour after leaving the fountain. Time was now precious. We did not know the distance of Jâsy, or how long we might wish to stay examining its ruins. But still I could not leave this spot without sketching the monument and its bas-reliefs, and taking bearings of the many important places in view. This is one of the best defined points for making a survey of the plain and banks and course of the 'Asy. Having completed my sketch, I planted my compass on the base of the pillar and proceeded to make observations. The following are the principal bearings taken: KA'a, S. 66 E.; Jâsy (old), N. 86 E.; Zerrâ'a, N. 66 E.; Ribleh, N. 60 E.; Tell Neby Mendan, N. 37 E.; Hurmâl village, N. 37 W. The river flows toward Ribleh in a winding course, making a slight curve to the northward. There is a considerable bend in it about an hour and a half from the monument; where, after running for some time south-east, it turns suddenly to the north. At this bend a canal is led from it across the plain to the modern village of Jâsy. This canal appears to be ancient. It is now choked up, and rendered useless. My attention was arrested by observing the blue summit of a far distant mountain, which greatly resembled Hermon. I could not, however, be certain that it was that mountain. It bore S. 34½ W.

While I was thus occupied, Mr. Barnett was busily engaged in making *fac-similes* of the marks and cuttings found on the lower part of the monument. When I had finished my work I joined him; and very soon became convinced that none of the marks were ever intended to form parts of inscriptions. Most of them are of very recent date, though a few are unquestionably of considerable antiquity; but not of the age of the structure itself. It is somewhat remarkable, that the same characters are found repeated in different places, and in different connections, and are arranged as if intended to represent *words*. But still the total want of order or regularity, combined with the fact that they are all within the reach of those standing on the base—that up so far, the whole surface is covered with them, while above the reach of man not a single mark of any kind can be seen—this, I say, is ample evidence that all these scratches are the work of peasants, shepherds, or idle Arabs. The Arabs are a curious race in this respect; if they see a heap of stones they will assuredly put one on the top of it; if they

see a number of rags tied to an old tree, they will not pass till one has been separated from their own stock, and hung up among its brethren; and I presume it is the very same reasons that prompt them to make these marks. If you ask them why they do these things, their answer will always be something like the following: "Perhaps it's a *Wely*; or perhaps it's a *blessing*; I don't know; but there must be good in it or nobody would do it."

That there were once inscriptions on this monument I have little doubt. It is not at all probable that such a structure would be erected without some inscribed record of its object or age. A minute examination of the fallen stones might amply repay the trouble and expense, by bringing to light some incident or epoch in the history of this land. The bas-reliefs on the three sides which still remain standing, are better executed than I had expected to find them. True, they have not the freedom and boldness of Grecian or Roman sculpture; yet they are far superior to many of those that have been brought forth by Layard from the fallen palaces of Nineveh. On one side is represented an elephant standing in the centre, with a bear rampant, *à l'air* dancing in front; while a bull is apparently about to charge him from behind. On another side are two stags with large horns, one standing, and the other *couchant*, as heralds would say. On the third side is a wild boar attacked by two dogs; two huge spears appear sticking in his sides. The monument stands on a pedestal composed of three layers of basalt, retreating like steps, each layer about two feet high. It is divided into three stories—one being a cube of solid masonry 29½ feet in the side, and about 26 feet high, with pilasters at the corners supporting a plain cornice. The bas-reliefs are on the upper part of this story. The second story is rather smaller, and has two pilasters on each side, besides those at the angles. The third is a pyramid. In the whole are forty layers of stones; and each being about two feet high, the height of the structure is about eighty feet.

Such is the monument of Harmûl as it now stands in the midst of this desert plain. Its origin and its history I leave to antiquarians, without even venturing a guess as to either.

At 12.20 we were again in the saddle, and turned our horses' heads to Jûsy, whose towers we could see far away across the arid plain, at the foot of the mountains. We had been warned to be on our guard against the 'Omûr, a powerful and warlike

tribe of Arabs, that had lately pitched their tents among the mountains south of Kâ'a and Jâsy; but, as we now saw the vast plain clear before us, and were besides well mounted, we resolved to neglect warnings, and visit this ancient city. We at first leaned a little to the right, to avoid a stony basalt Tell; but, after passing it, rode straight to our destination. Nothing could be imagined more dreary and desolate than this undulating plain around the Kama'a. Fragments of basalt, limestone and flint are thickly strewn over it; and the whole appears as if it had been exposed for years to the action of intense heat. The stunted shrubs look as if they were charred, and there is now no sign of other vegetation. Yet I have no doubt, that in early spring it would present another aspect, after being watered by the winter rains. It is the scorching rays of the sun acting upon the black basalt strata, that give it its present blasted look. There was no path, and we found it dreary enough marching over these broad fields of stones.

At 1.10 we had the village of Kâ'a about half an hour on our right. There is a large building like an ancient fortress, a short distance below it. It may, however, have been one of those great Khâns which we find, now in ruins, on all the principal thoroughfares of Syria. In twenty-five minutes more we crossed one of the branches of the great canal that is led from the fountain of Lebweh; there was now no water in it; but there were evidences that it had only been conducted in some other course a few hours previously. A few minutes after, we entered a tract of fine soil, well cultivated and abundantly watered. The change was as sudden as it was remarkable, from the desert we had just left behind. The border was as clearly marked as a sea line; on the one side the arid flinty plain, on the other the rich alluvial soil. Is this a natural distinction, or is it the result of cultivation? I am inclined to think it is partly owing to both. This fertile tract continued for three quarters of an hour, when the blasted stony plain again commences. At 2.45 we had on our left a small ruined village, and at three o'clock reached Jâsy.

As we reached the spot where we were persuaded the ruins stood, we felt disappointed and surprised to observe only one or two diminutive towers; but, on advancing a few hundred yards further, we found that the rest had been concealed by their position. A shallow Wady here descends from the mountains, and in this stood the ancient city. The ruins of Jâsy are situated

about a quarter of a mile from the base of Antilebanon. The western ridge of these mountains is cut through by a deep ravine just above the village of Ka'a; and from it to another above Jûsy they retreat a little, forming a kind of bosom. Beyond the latter place, they run out somewhat farther into the plain; and thus these ruins, as seen from the Tell at Râs, appeared in a line with the base of the mountains. Seldom have I seen a place so completely desolate; and never have I seen ruins of such extent so totally devoid of interest. Their present desolation is no doubt owing to the want of water. The city was supplied wholly by reservoirs in the form of large walls with small circular openings. Great numbers of these are found among the ruins and in the plain around. They were filled by the winter rains, or perhaps by the streams from the mountains during the rainy season. The ruins are, as nearly as I could estimate, about two miles and a half in circumference. There are no signs now remaining of architectural beauty, or great wealth. The principal building is a square castle 132 yards on each side, having flanking towers at the angles. One of the gates is still standing; it is low, and has a square top; the whole is surrounded by a deep moolding. The walls are built of large stones, and the workmanship appears to be of the later Roman period. It resembles in form and design the citadel or castle I had formerly seen at the ruined city near Maksûra, on the plain of Damascus; but the workmanship is inferior, and there are in it no remains of columns. Four square towers, of much inferior workmanship and later date, are the only other buildings that remain. Over the doorway of one of the latter there is a cross in relief. Large heaps of rubbish appear on every side, composed of hewn stones and the *debris* of fallen buildings. The foundations of large houses, and even the lines of the ancient rectangular streets, can in places be traced; but it appears as if the stones had been removed for the construction of some other places; probably of the extensive structures of the modern Jûsy. These ruins are called *old Jûsy*, to distinguish them from the other.

The question naturally arises: Can these ruins be identified? The name at present given to it is as old as the time of Abulfeda; and must also have been applied to it considerably before his period. There was then not only a town or village, but a district of that name. This district would appear from him to

have been north of Salemyeh, as he thus writes: "The district of Jâsieh, and the district of Salemyeh, and the district of Lebanon, even until it extends to the district of Kâstâl, between Hums and Damascus." This, however, must be a mistake, for in another place he remarks that the monument of Hurmâl and the 'Ain of the 'Asy are between Jâsieh and Râa. (Tab. Syr. p. 27 and 150.) I am rather of opinion, however, that Abulfeda makes reference to the *modern* Jâsy, and not to these ruins. There are here no marks of this city having been inhabited by Mohammedans, or since their conquest of Syria. There is not a vestige of Saracene architecture in the place. There is not a mosque, nor a minaret, nor a place for prayer; and there can be little doubt, that had there ever been any, they would have been spared until at least all others had been completely destroyed. The modern Jâsy is only half an hour distant, and in it are important buildings which appeared to me from the place where I viewed them, to be of Saracenic origin and ancient date. Here, too, is a large mosque and a noble minaret still standing, though the place is deserted.

This is a city such as might be erected at the command of some monarch; but could never attain importance of itself, or from the advantages of its position. In fact, it could never have existed at all, except during the period when this land was densely populated. It has no supply of water; it is encompassed by an arid, stony and desert plain; while on the banks of the river, a few miles below, are most eligible sites for cities. In this respect, then, we might naturally ascribe its origin to some of those Grecian monarchs of Syria, who appear to have had a mania for architecture. But the present ruins are not of so early a date; and, so far as we could see, there is not a single inscription among them. It has been conjectured that this is the *Laodicea Scabiosa* of Ptolemy (Geog. VI. 15), or the *Λαοδικία* or *Λαοδικία* of the ancient coins, and referred to by Strabo as standing near or at the northern end of Antilebanon. But if that Laodicea was identical with the *Laudicia* on the Itinerary of Antonine, as I think it was, then the position of Jâsy does not at all agree with the distances there given. It is there represented as only eighteen miles from Hums or Emesa, while it is sixty-four from Ba'albek or Heliopolis. But, from a careful computation, I have found that Jâsy is twenty-five miles from Hums, and only about thirty-seven from Ba'albek. Therefore, if the

Itinerary be correct, Jûsy cannot be identified with the ancient Laodicea.

From this place I took the following bearings: Zerrâ'a and Kuseir, N. 6 E.; modern Jûsy, N. 9 W.; Ribleh, N. 28 W.

We left the ruins at 3.30, and at four o'clock had modern Jûsy a few minutes on our right. Here are also ruins of considerable extent. A tall minaret is the most conspicuous object. The soil here is fertile, and the canal from the 'Asy, above mentioned, could easily be made to bring abundant water for irrigation; but the Arabs appear determined that it shall remain waste. Ibrahim Pasha built it up, and planted in it a little colony of peasants; but, when his government was overthrown by western intervention, and the wild desert hordes no longer feared his strong hand, Jûsy was soon laid waste again. Last year a wealthy Christian of Hums farmed it, and brought a little colony from Sâdâd, the great seat of the Jacobites. But the Arabs again came and quarrelled with the new occupiers. One of the former was killed, and the villagers, to escape a bloody revenge, were forced to desert their newly erected homes. Continuing our course across a fine plain we reached Ribleh at 4.35.

Ribleh is now a wretched village of some forty houses, standing on the right bank of the Orontes. The banks of the river are here low, and a plain of great fertility stretches away on every side. In Ribleh, the only remains of antiquity are the foundations of a square tower constructed of large hewn stones. The Sheikh informed us, however, that in the gardens and fields around, the traces of ancient buildings of considerable extent are found beneath the soil. The glory of Ribleh is gone; but one can still see that a more suitable situation for the head quarters of a large army could nowhere in northern Syria be selected. The rich plain, the salubrious air, the abundant waters, and the ready access by easy and open roads to every part of the country, all show that the kings of Babylon and Egypt, whose armies encamped here, were well acquainted with the land, and perfectly capable of taking advantage of its resources.

From Ribleh, Tell Neby Mindan bears N. 5 W. This bearing is important as fixing the course of the 'Asy. El-Kuseir, N. 33½ E.; Zerrâ'a, S. 86 E. The ridge of Antilebanon gradually decreases in altitude beyond Jûsy; but before it terminates there is a very singular pass, which cuts off its northern end, leaving a group of hills about an hour in length completely isolated. The

road through this pass is in a line with Ribleh, and bears S. 76 E. This road, if continued in a straight line, would pass over the plain about two miles north of Hasya. The mountains of Lebanon run out in a point toward the lake, and their termination bears from hence N. 35 W.

Saturday, Oct. 15th. We started this morning from Ribleh at 6.7, glad to effect our escape from the myriads of fleas that had assailed us during the night. The king of the fleas is said to dwell at Tiberias; if this be so, he must also have a summer residence and a large establishment at Ribleh. Our course was now north-east, along the winding banks of the 'Asy. A busy pastoral scene here presented itself to our view. The black tents of the Arabs lined the borders of the stream. Thousands of sheep and goats, filling the air with their bleatings, were going forth to pasture; each flock led along by its own shepherd. They followed him, for they knew his voice. Vast herds of camels had already wandered off to some distance; the old ones were solemnly browsing amid the luxuriant herbage, while the young were trying to convert their awkward and ungainly motions into something like play. Peasants, too, were seen in the fields turning up the soil with primitive-looking ploughs, and urging on their teams of oxen with patriarchal goads. It was just such a scene as one might have witnessed in the same spot three thousand years ago. It was such pictures as these, that the prophets of God were familiar with in ancient days; and from such they drew those beautiful and striking figures we now read and admire in their writings.

At 6.30 we crossed the first tributary of the 'Asy, by a deep and difficult ford. This stream flows from a fine fountain at the village of Zerrâ'a, three quarters of an hour on our right. It runs across the flat and rich plain in a sluggish course, and falls into the 'Asy a few yards below the ford. The 'Asy here turns N. by W., toward the high Tell called Neby Mindan. Our road was in a straight line along its right bank. The river winds gracefully through the plain, and is lined with the rankest vegetation. Hundreds of water fowl float upon its surface, or stalk along the water's edge. The nimble duck and melancholy heron are seen at almost every step; while stately storks wander over the neighboring fields. At seven o'clock we had the large village of Kuseir half an hour on our right, in the midst of a naked but fertile plain. Fifteen minutes after, I observed a little island

in the stream; a large mill is built upon it, and a fine bridge spans the right channel. At 8.13 we passed the Tell Neby Mindan; it is situated on the left bank of the river, about fifteen minutes from our road. It is evidently artificial, and resembles many others found in this region, and in the various plains of Syria. A small village and a white-domed Wely stand upon its summit; and I could plainly see extensive ruins scattered along its base. I was anxious to visit it, but the desire of reaching Hums at an early hour prevented me. I had been informed at the village of Ribleh, that a large tributary falls into the Orontes beside this Tell. I tried to distinguish the precise point of junction; but was not able, owing to the reeds and tall grass that covered the banks and the plain around. It appeared, however, from the nature of the ground, that the Tell and ruins occupy the angle above the junction. This tributary flows from a large fountain called 'Ain et-Tannûr, nearly an hour distant from the Tell.

After a delay of seven minutes, occupied in examining the Tell with my glass, and in taking bearings of Kuseir (S. 38 E.), and Kul'at el-Husn (N. 38 W.) which I had seen for some time on the brow of the mountain in the distance, I continued my journey. Five minutes afterward we had on our left the small village Arjân; and in twenty minutes more I saw on the opposite side of the river a considerable village, with what appeared to be ancient ruins around it. I got its name from an Arab woman whose utterance was none of the most distinct, but I thought it was Um el-Adâm. About ten minutes on our right I now noticed a very singular rectangular mound, hollow in the centre, and surrounded by a dyke of earth of uniform height along the sides, but elevated at the corners. It struck me at once as being an ancient entrenched camp. As seen from the road, it appears to be square, with the sides from two to three hundred yards in length. At 8.45 I saw Kefr Mûsa on the left bank of the river, and opposite to it a smaller village in ruins. At 8.57 we reached a large artificial Tell on the left of the road, and I ascended it to gain a view of the southern end of the lake and the *débouché* of the river. From this spot the line of our route from Tell Neby Mindan bore S. 25 W.; the upper end of the lake N. 33 W.; and Hums N. 55 E. The lake was now spread out before me. The river falls into it at its south-western angle, about twenty-five minutes from this Tell. The

castle of Hums is not visible from this place, on account of the swell in the plain beyond the lake. Towards the west appears a broad opening, between the mountains of Lebanon, and the Ansariyeh range; which must have been regarded not only as a conspicuous landmark, but an important pass in every age of Syrian history. This is the natural outlet of the great plains of Hums and Hamah.

Descending the Tell we rode at a quick pace after our servants along the beautiful plain. We soon overtook them, and at 9.20 reached the little village of Kefr 'Ady. The margin of the lake is here about ten minutes distant; and a little island, with a lofty Tell in it, lies about fifteen minutes from the shore. At 9.45 we saw on our left a high artificial mound on the margin of the water; and ten minutes after passed a little to the right of Shaumeriyeh. The lake was now close to the road; but the shore being greatly indented, the distance is very various. At 10.25 we reached the small village of Kuseib, situated on a little mound whose base is washed by the waves. Thus far our road had been pretty nearly in the direction of Hums, and from this place the main road runs direct over the swelling plain to the city. After a delay of ten minutes we turned to the left, round the south-eastern angle of the lake, where we had the village of Kattineh a few minutes on our right, and beyond it Mubärekeh. In fifteen minutes we reached a lofty Tell close to the eastern shore; and from its summit had a commanding view of the lake, and the country round. From this place Tell Neby Mindan bears S. W.; the island S. 70 W., and Hums N. 58 E. The whole country to the south and east of the lake is one vast plain, thinly inhabited, but of great fertility. On the north side, the ground rises in an easy swell. It seems rugged and covered with loose stones, all of trap rock. The trap formation also extends southward to near the base of Antilebanon.

We rode hence to the end of the great dam at the north-eastern extremity of the lake, which is only a few minutes distant. We walked along its summit to near the tower at the opposite side. This is unquestionably a work of high antiquity, and was intended to raise the water of the river to such an elevation, as would enable the people to conduct it in canals over the plain around Hums, for the purposes of irrigation. Some of these canals are still perfect and carry the water to the gardens and fields; but the greater number are neglected and in ruins. The

embankment is from four to five hundred yards in length; but in no place exceeds twelve or fourteen feet in height. It appears to have been built and rebuilt almost times without number. Specimens of the workmanship of every nation, that has in its period ruled over these plains, may here be seen; from the proud successors of Alexander, and the enterprising procurators of Rome, down to the petty Pashas of modern Turkey. A small half-ruined tower stands at the northern end of the dam; perhaps intended to guard it against the wanton aggressions of the Arabs. From this place the river flows through a broad but shallow vale to a point some distance north of Hama. Ten minutes below the dam, on the left bank, is the little village of Suddeh; and farther down are Hadideh and Rubeiyeh.

At 11.30 we again mounted, and struck across the plain through fine fields to the main road, which we reached in a quarter of an hour. This road is excellent, and the plain around can scarcely be surpassed for fertility. At twelve o'clock we saw Nukeireh, about twenty minutes distant on our right, and beside it an artificial mound. Half an hour further Keft 'Aya stood on the same side and about equally distant. In a few minutes farther we passed close to a lofty Tell on the left of the road; a little to the east of it stands the small village called Wely Bab 'Omar. At 1.15 we entered the gate of Hama.

The town of Hama is situated in the midst of a vast plain, that extends in some places till it meets the horizon. One of my first spare moments during my brief stay was employed in ascending the castle hill, and examining minutely the whole region within the range of vision. I was accompanied by a Greek priest called Esa, reputed one of the most learned men in Hama, and Sulimân 'Awad, a member of the ancient Jacobite church, intimately acquainted with the whole surrounding country, and noted for his intelligence and veracity. Adjusting my compass on a fragment of the ancient castle wall, I now examined in succession the several sections of the country in sight, beginning at the north. On this side the plain extends unbroken to a group of four hills, the two centre ones of which are called Kurûn Hamah, the Horns of Hamah. The valley between them in which the town is built bears N. 13 E. On the road to it, two hours and a half distant, is a Tell with ruins and a village called Bish. A little eastward are seen the blue

summits of a far distant mountain range, where, according to Sulimân, are many villages, the houses of which are all built of stone, similar to those found in the Hauran. This is in the district of Selemya, or Salemyeh as it is written by Abulfeda. In a line with the termination of this range eastward is the village of Deir Ba'laba, some forty minutes distant, N. 39 E. Abrineh, about an hour off, bears N. 17 E.; and Zeidân, forty minutes distant, S. 80 E. In a line with the latter, on the horizon, begins a range of hills that runs away to the south; they are called *Jebel esh-Shumariyeh*. Feirdzeh, a small village forty minutes distant, bears S. 51 E.; and Meskeny, two hours, S. 16 E. The Damascus road runs in nearly a straight line to Hasya, S. 4 W.; it has only a slight curve to the west. On the south-east is seen the mountain range that bounds the broad valley of Kur-yetein; and on the south another lower range crosses the plain between Hasya and Kâra, running eastward toward Sûdûd. The eastern base of the great chain of Antilebanon is marked by a line extending S. 7 W.; and the western, by one running S. 37 W. In this range is a lofty conical peak, about two hours distant from its extremity, which forms a very conspicuous object from every part of this plain; it is called *Jebel Halmeh*. The monument of Hurmûl is distinctly seen near the centre of the opening into the Bukâ'a, S. 42½ W. Tell Neby Mindan bears S. 52 W. Between Lebanon and the Ansariyeh mountains is a broad plain; but the view in this direction is shut in by the elevation of the ground westward of the lake; so that even the castle of el-Husn cannot be seen. The lake of Hums, or of *Kedes*, as it is also called, is a fine sheet of water. Its dimensions, however, have been greatly exaggerated. By careful bearings and calculations I have ascertained that its extreme length is six geographical miles and its greatest breadth about half that number. The dam is six miles distant from Hums, S. W. This lake is in a great measure, if not altogether artificial, and the bed of the stream before it was made was near the southern border. Along the banks of the river opposite the town are the gardens of Hums, celebrated for their beauty and for the abundance of their fruits.

Such was the wide panorama that was spread out before me as I stood amid the ruins of this old castle,—an unbroken plain extending for many hours on every side, without a hill to vary the monotony, and without a single tree save the little group in

the gardens of the city. The villages only occur at long intervals, and there is no other sign of human habitation. Turkish rapacity and misrule have contributed to depopulate and lay waste one of the fairest portions of Syria; and the few inhabitants that still remain can only manage to drag out a life of poverty and toil, by paying "black mail" to Arab chiefs and exorbitant taxes to Turkish Pashas. Almost the only objects of interest in an antiquarian point of view, in this whole region, are the artificial mounds that meet the eye in every direction; but which are found in greatest number along the banks of the 'Asy. They are regular in form, generally resembling truncated cones; varying in height from fifty to two hundred and fifty feet, with a circumference in proportion. The sides and summits are covered with loose whitish gravel, like the *debris* of some vast structure, that had been originally made up of bricks and small stones united by cement. These mounds are also found in the Buk'a and plain of Damascus. Villages either inhabited or in ruins are generally built upon, or beside them; and fountains or large wells are always seen near those that are at a distance from the river's bank. In every respect similar to these are the mounds described by Layard and others as existing on the plains of the ancient Assyria; and I have no doubt but that the origin of them all may be traced to the same people. At the Tell es-Salahtyeh, one of the largest of these mounds on the plains of Damascus, I found an Assyrian bas-relief; and, at a place where its side had been in part carried away by the waters of the Barada, the layers of brick are still visible.

The mound on which the castle of Hums stands is of this character. I did not measure it; but estimated its diameter at 300 yards, and its height at 200 feet. It was formerly encompassed by a deep ditch, now in part filled up with rubbish from the town. Its sloping sides were paved with small square blocks of basalt, forming an excellent escarpment; portions of this still remain, but by far the greater part has been carried off to pave the streets of the town. On the summit of the scarp was a lofty rampart or wall of great strength; the facing being of large limestone blocks, and the centre, rubble embedded in cement. Not a fragment of the castle itself now remains. And the only buildings standing are a few portions of the exterior flanking towers on the northern wall; these are principally

of Saracenic origin. The whole summit of the Tell is covered with heaps of rubbish, mixed with which I observed several large fragments of red and gray granite columns, the remains, no doubt, of some once stately temple. Underneath the rubbish are numerous large vaulted chambers, formerly used as magazines and stores for the garrison. A subterranean passage seems to have connected the castle on the summit with the town at the base of the hill; it is now in a great measure filled up, but the priest pointed out to me an opening at the foot of the mound leading into it. A modern Wely with a white dome stands on the summit of the Tell, and is a conspicuous object for many miles round.

The town of Hums is on the northern side of the castle. It is said to contain 20,000 inhabitants, of whom 7000 are Christians, chiefly of the Greek church. There is here also a small community of the ancient Syrian or Jacobite church. These are a singular and interesting people. They have not the cringing subdued look of the other Christians; they are independent in spirit, and bold and resolute in their conduct. They are all originally from the village of Sūdūd, and are thence called Sūdūdtyeh. Ninety years ago not a single Jacobite was found save in that little village; while now they number 6000 souls, and colonies from them occupy entirely the villages of Zeidān, Meskinēh, Feirūzy, Furtaka and Kuseib; and others have settled in Kuseir, and in Hamah. This sect is thus rapidly increasing, while almost all the others are rapidly diminishing; and this is all the more remarkable, as their homes are with one or two exceptions on the very outskirts of civilization.

Hums is one of the cleanest and most regular towns I have seen in Syria. The streets are in general well paved with square blocks of basalt; and the walls of the houses are of the same material, so that there is not consequently such an accumulation of mud and dust as is found in Damascus. No buildings of ancient origin are now standing; but large hewn stones, and fragments of columns of granite, basalt, and limestone, are seen scattered in great profusion through the various parts of the town, and testify to its antiquity and former architectural beauty. Walls of modern date encompass the town, with the exception of the side next the castle, but they are only fit for repelling a sudden incursion of wild Arabs. On the N. W. side of the town, beside the barracks, are the foundations of

ancient baths; and here I observed some squares of fine Mosaic pavement. Hums is celebrated among the Muslims as containing the tombs of some of the earliest friends and companions of their prophet. The most honored of these is that of the renowned Khaled ibn el-Walid, the greatest general of the first ages of Islâm. I saw several fragments of Greek inscriptions in the walls and various parts of the streets, but none of them are of any historical importance.

It was our wish to proceed from Hums to Südd; but this district being constantly exposed to the incursions of plundering parties from the Arab tribes, cannot be traversed in safety except with a strong escort, or in the company of a caravan. It so happened that no caravan left during our allotted time, and we were, consequently, obliged to return to Damascus by the direct route.

Tuesday, Oct. 18th. At 11.30 we left the gate of Hums, and skirting the castle hill, proceeded along the great caravan road southward. Our friends accompanied us for some distance, and then took an affectionate farewell; uttering many prayers for our safety. Near the city the plain is well cultivated; but, after a few miles, cultivation is only in patches, and it soon disappears altogether. Here is a rich plain reaching to the horizon eastward, and many miles westward, totally desolate and forsaken. The road is excellent and we passed over it at a rapid pace; for there was nothing to be seen, and much to be feared. At 1.3 we had on our left the small village of Shinshâr, built within the walls of an old Khân. The inhabitants can thus resist sudden incursions of plundering Arabs, and guard their flocks from thieves by night. At 2.7 we reached Shemsîn, another old caravansary inhabited by a few families. The people came out around us here with as much surprise in their faces, as if we had descended from the clouds. The idea of four solitary horsemen thus travelling along such a road at such a time, was more than they could comprehend. From this place I saw Hasya, S. 5 E.; and turning to the west could also see the Tell Neby Mindan, N. 85 W.; and the castle of el-Husn. Along the whole eastern horizon the plain now spread out like a sea, without a hill or mountain, or solitary object to break the naked uniformity. After a delay of twelve minutes we again set out, and at 2.50 had the first swell of Antilebanon rising out of the plain half an hour on our right. Here were some singular looking pits near the road, which are said to have been made by the Arabs, as hiding places in which

to lie in wait for travellers and small caravans. We had been warned of the great danger we were exposed to in travelling alone along this dreary and unguarded road; and we now saw how easily a plundering band of Arabs on their fleet mares could intercept and strip us. Just as we crossed a gentle swell, we saw a party of horsemen away on the right near the foot of the hills, marching at a quick pace. They almost immediately varied their course and turned eastward, as if about to cross our path or intercept us; but they were still so distant that we could neither tell their number nor appearance. After a few minutes they disappeared in a little Wady. Seeing an isolated tower on the road in front, we pressed on our horses to reach it, if possible, ere the party should come up, that we might thus have a place in which to defend ourselves in case of attack. After an anxious half hour we reached at last the brow of the Wady; but we looked in vain for our supposed foes. In a few minutes, however, I observed a single horseman, away to the right and considerably behind us; while on a rising ground far beyond, the others soon appeared going up the mountain side. This is a land where every man fears his fellow. These were no doubt a party of peasants or peaceful village elders going to some place in the plain of Hums; but seeing our party they dreaded an attack, and by a stratagem escaped, as they supposed, imminent danger. We crossed the Wady and reached the little tower at four o'clock. Beside it is a reservoir, near which is a stone with a long and beautiful Arabic inscription. From this place we looked directly through the singular pass in the mountain range referred to above; a straight line, therefore, drawn from hence to Ribleh would run through it. In twenty-five minutes more we rode into Hasya. We were thus only four hours and forty-two minutes travelling; but this represents a distance of about twenty geographical miles.

Hasya was originally one of those great Khâns that are found at intervals along the caravan road between Damascus and Aleppo. When it became ruinous, huts were erected within its walls, and a few families of peasants found protection here while they cultivated a portion of the surrounding plain. A fine stream of water, collected by a subterranean canal, was formerly brought to it from the eastward; but, as this rendered it a favorite halting place for government troops, the people destroyed the canal in order to be freed from the exactions and insolence of these

licensed bandits. They now suffer severely from the scarcity of this necessary element, and yet they rejoice that their scheme was productive of the desired effect. The village is now the residence of one of the border chiefs, who are employed by government to protect travellers and caravans, and keep in check the wandering Arabs; and who are authorized to maintain a competent force of irregular cavalry. Muhammed es-Suidan, the present Aga, is a man of pleasing manners and considerable information; though deficient in that dignity so generally found in these hereditary chieftains. He received us with great kindness and hospitality, and showed an intense anxiety to obtain information about the various nations of Europe, their extent, population, and military force. We happened to have with us one of the admirable little compendiums of geography, lately published at the Beirût mission press; and we presented it to him. He seemed greatly pleased with the gift; and especially with the facility with which he was able to obtain the information he desired about the various nations and cities. He was appointed to his present station on the death of his uncle Saleh Aga, about two years and a half ago. The death of the latter was a fearful tragedy; though unfortunately such are too often enacted in this unhappy land. Some tribes of the Anezy had disputed with other Arabs from the northern part of Syria, and had collected a large force to war against them. Saleh Aga proceeded to their encampment with an escort of only thirty men, to endeavor to maintain peace. Owing to some imprudence on the part of his retinue, or some old feud between them and the Arabs, the latter surrounded them with a body of twelve hundred horse, and fell with headlong fury on the devoted little band. A brief but feeble resistance was made. The Aga was taken alive and hanged in a few minutes after. Twelve of his men were killed on the spot; and the remainder without an exception left wounded and bleeding on the plain. The Arabs fled, and assistance having come, the wounded men were conveyed to Hasya, where in the end most of them recovered. From those very men I had a narrow escape only about a week before the occurrence of this bloody scene; having been a prisoner in their hands for two days in the desert near Palmyra.

The Aga expressed his surprise that we had come alone from Hama, and said what I had sometimes heard before: "You

English regard your lives and property as of little value." "But we saw no Arabs," was our reply. "True!" he answered, and his words are worthy of attention, "True! and you might go ten times in perfect safety, and the eleventh be shot." The road he informed us was now very unsafe. Two large tribes of the Wulid 'Aly had lately pitched their tents around the copious fountains of Kuryetein; and the 'Omûr were in the northern defiles of Antilebanon. He had received private information, he told us, that some parties of these intended to take advantage of the present unsettled state of affairs, and intercept passengers and caravans on the road. He said we could not go alone to Kâra; but as a caravan was to proceed in a few hours, we had better travel in company. I did not much like this arrangement, as it would prevent me from getting such a view of the country as I wished to obtain; but still we thought it best to follow his advice.

Hasya is situated in the plain about half an hour from the base of the mountains. The general direction of the main chain of Antilebanon from Hermon upwards is, as we have seen, N. E. The termination of the range is marked by a line running diagonally to its course from north to south, and half an hour westward of Hasya. The breadth of the mountains being considerable (about two hours) and the range being thus cut off diagonally; the end toward Hasya resembles in consequence of this, the *side* of a mountain range, and a long triangular point is formed with its apex toward the north. It is this point that is intersected by the gap between Hasya and Ribleh. At the foot of the mountains opposite Hasya are two small villages in ruins. From Hasya to Sûdûd is two and a half hours. They are separated by a swell in the plain, which is the continuation of a spur that runs out from Antilebanon near the village of Bureij. From Sûdûd to Kuryetein is about five hours. The whole district northward of a line drawn from Ribleh to Kuryetein is one vast plain, as far as the eye can see; while that southward is intersected by long parallel ranges of mountains.

At 8.50 P. M. our servants informed us the horses were ready; so bidding adieu to our kind host we mounted at once. We now found that the Aga had attached three of his horsemen to us as a guard, with instructions to keep by our sides till we entered Kâra; and not on any account to leave the caravan. The latter we found had been gone some time. Our road was

up a gentle slope in a direction S. 5 E.; the foot of the mountains being about half an hour on our right. The moon was full and shining gloriously in an unclouded sky, so that I was able to mark angles and time with as much accuracy as during the day. The general features of the country were also clearly seen; and the only difficulty I experienced was in calculating the distances of the hills and mountains we saw to the right and left. This information, however, our companions were fully competent to give. In an hour we came up with our caravan, consisting of about seventy animals, camels, mules and donkeys, accompanied by from thirty to forty men mostly armed with muskets. A few horsemen were likewise attached to it. At 10.20 we had on our right an old ruined tower; and here the ground became more broken and stony, with low white hills at intervals. We here also changed our course to south and then to S. 5 W.; and, after a dreary ride of nearly two hours over a rocky plain, we reached Bureij at 12.10. We were now considerably in advance of the caravan; and our guards requested us to wait till it came up, as the most dangerous part of the road was still before us. We accordingly sat down on an old sarcophagus beside the now barred gate. This village, like the others, was formerly a large fortified Khân, within whose crumbling walls the peasants now rest in security. Only a few weeks previously their flocks had been wholly carried off by a plundering party of the Anezy; but, after a sharp pursuit by the Aga and some forty of his followers, the robbers were overtaken, and the greater part of the sheep and goats recaptured. From this village Sûdûd is visible.

In half an hour the caravan came up, and we again set out, entering almost immediately a shallow Wady between low swelling hills of white limestone. Passing through this we skirted (1.30) the western side of a lofty conical peak, the commencement of a low broken range that runs away toward Sûdûd. Our guards enlivened the dreariness of our ride by some exciting tales of border warfare, the scenes of which were laid in the plain that now opened up before us; and just at this spot an incident occurred, which we for a few moments thought would afford us an example of such contests as our companions so graphically described. On ascending the eminence on the western slope of the hill, we observed, at once, the dark outlines of a large party appearing in front. On account of the inequality

of the ground, we were within gun-shot ere we recognized them; it was at once evident they were Arabs. The cry was suddenly raised, "Arabs! Arabs!" and in a moment every gun was seized, and the sharp tick of the locks was heard on every side. We were in front and our guards beside us. The advancing party was challenged but returned no reply, and came on at a quick pace. Again we cried, "Who comes?" and our guards presented their muskets; when fortunately at that moment a friendly answer was returned, or a volley would have been poured into them. They turned out to be Arabs from the neighborhood of Hums returning from Damascus.

We were now on the borders of a little plain almost completely encompassed by low white hills. Close on our right was an irregular and broken ascent leading to a plateau, that reaches to the foot of the main ridge of mountains. To the eastward is an opening through which the plain is drained. A group of little Tells with shelving gravelly sides rises up in front of the line of road; and we were obliged to turn to the right a little to avoid it. Skirting their base we came at 2.20 to a fine grassy meadow with two little fountains bubbling up in the centre of it. This place is called 'Aym el-'Alak; there are no ruins near it, so far as I could ascertain. On the south of the fountain is a low swell terminating in a conical hill, on the summit of which stands a ruined tower.

This spot is celebrated as a resort for robbers. Bands of Arabs come here mounted on their fleetest steeds, and remain quietly seated round the fountain until their pickets give notice of the approach of a caravan or band of travellers. They then bear down upon their expected prey, with almost the swiftness of eagles. Except fire-arms are abundant, resistance is worse than useless. The booty is seized; the horses' heads turned eastward; and these noble animals soon bear them far beyond the reach of pursuit. It sometimes happens, however, that a few well-directed shots turn the tide of battle. The Arabs never carry guns themselves on these occasions; the spear is their only weapon; and, when they meet with a determined band armed with a few muskets, they will rarely risk their own lives or those of their justly prized horses in a contest. During the present summer a caravan was here attacked by a party of about thirty Bedawin, who descended from a little valley on the north of the plain and dashed upon their rear. As some time

elapsed ere the Arabs came up, hasty preparations were made for defence; and, as one was attempting to lead off some camels, a well-directed shot killed his mare. Stung to madness by such resistance from a small band, they spurred their horses among the loaded animals and endeavored to spear their conductors; but just then a small party of the Aga's irregular horse was seen surmounting the hill. The Bedawin fled at once; but another shot disabled one of their horses; and this, with the two dismounted men, remained in the hands of the victors. The captured Arabs seemed more concerned about their animals than themselves. They were taken to Hasya, the wounded mare being led gently along by its owner who refused to leave its side. That night he insisted on being left with it; and it was observed that he took off his cloak, and covered with it his prized steed; while he tore up his shirt, *his only other garment*, and bandaged with the fragments the wounded limb.

After a short delay we again set out. There was nothing now to fear; and so we rode on at a quick pace; and crossing the rising ground, turned to the right, and reached Kâra in forty minutes. Kâra is a large village, with two spacious and well built Khâns. The country around is a stony undulating plain, white and barren-looking; and, with the exception of a few gardens by the side of the stream on the south, the whole is bleak and uninteresting. Kâra I have ascertained to be about eighteen geographical miles due south of Hasya.

Here we dismissed our guards, and accompanied by a single Kurdish horseman, who had requested permission to join our party, we mounted, after half an hour's rest, and set out for Nebk. The road is winding for the first hour and a half, owing to the nature of the ground. In three quarters of an hour we saw, on our left, on the summit of a little hill, a ruined tower. These towers seem to have been placed thus at intervals on commanding stations to serve as watch towers. We now turned to the left through an opening in a low range of hills; and after twenty minutes again resumed our former course. We could at this place see the trees of Deir 'Attyeh about half an hour on our left. We were now passing through a plain, in great part cultivated and perfectly level. As we rode along we were surprised and somewhat alarmed to hear repeated discharges of musketry in the direction of the last-named village. The night was far advanced; and we could not imagine any cause for

such firing, except an encounter between the villagers and the Arabs. We spurred on our horses, but could observe that the volleys became nearer, and also more regular and frequent. Ere many minutes, the sound of horses' feet was heard in the distance; and a dark figure was seen approaching. In a few seconds a cavalier drew up at gallop, and reigning up his steed directly in our path, demanded whence we came. Ere we could reply, two others joined him; and we could observe that they all had their arms ready for attack. Our first thought was, that they were some Arabs, who, having been beaten off from Deir Attyeh, were about to try whether fortune would favor them in attacking us. We soon saw, however, by the fur caps and strange accent, that they were not Bedawin; but our anxiety was not much lessened by this discovery. We did not fear the result of an attack, should they attempt it, for in numbers we had the advantage, as well as in arms. But the Kurds, as we well knew, and some of us from experience, are reckless scoundrels; and it was far from being our wish to be forced to defend ourselves against them. After a little talk, our anxiety was relieved by hearing that they were the advance guard of a troop of irregular cavalry, despatched on a private mission by the commander in chief in Damascus. We soon after learned what this mission was; and I will only say here, that in baseness and treachery it was quite characteristic of Turkish policy in Syria. Like most of such schemes, however, it proved wholly fruitless. At six o'clock we reached the gate of Nebk. Having thus been in the saddle nearly all night and part of the preceding day, without sleep and with little food, we felt somewhat exhausted. Reaching the Sheikh's house, we threw ourselves on the floor and were soon fast asleep.

Wednesday, Oct. 19th. After a few hours' sleep and a hasty breakfast, I went to the top of a hill, on the northern slope of which Nebk is built, to get a good view of the surrounding country. From this spot I was enabled to connect my former observations of the country further south, with those made during the present tour; and thus to complete the survey of the main ridges of Antilebanon. I will here give a brief summary of the result of my observations. These minute details are no doubt wearisome; but it must be remembered, that this region is little known, and, ere it can be accurately delineated on maps, it must be minutely described. No part of Syria is without

interest. In every district Scripture names are found; and in every town, and almost every village, we still see the vestiges of some place, whose name is recorded on the page of history.

The mountain range of Ma'lûla sweeps round N. by W. some distance north of the village of Yabrûd; and runs in so as to join the foot of the great central chain. At the point where it curves, it is broken into two irregular ridges, and in the valley between them is the village of Sihil. The scenery round it is very peculiar. The mountain ridges are broken into a series of conical peaks, whose steep shelving sides are covered with white gravel, the debris of limestone rocks; and the summits crowned with cliffs that resemble in the distance the crumbling ruins of ancient castles. From the point where the curve commences, a low irregular swell runs away towards the north-east, forming the side of a plateau that extends to the foot of the great chain. Between Sihil and Kâra, a spur strikes out eastward from this ascent, dividing the lower plain. This spur is low, irregular, and almost completely barren. On the east of Nebk is a lofty line of bleak mountains, commencing, as formerly stated, near the village of Kuteifeh, and dividing the plain of Jerûd from that of 'Ain et-Tneh and Nebk; it runs on in a course about N. E. between Sûdûd and Kuryetein; and, afterwards turning eastward, forms the northern wall of the great plain that extends from the latter place to Tadmor. The following bearings were taken from this spot: Deir 'Atîyeh, N. 30 E.; Kâra, N. 6 E.; Sihil, N. 76 W.; Yabrûd, S. 67 W.; Kûstûl and road to Damascus, S. 25 W. The distance of Nebk from Kâra is nine miles.

At 1.25 we again mounted our horses, and, passing the fine Khân, rode for some distance along the banks of a little stream brought by a canal from the plain below Yabrûd. On every side of us now were little circular structures, built of small stones and mud, resembling sheep-pens. Here was the camp of Ibrahim Pasha for a short time during his Syrian campaign. On our left was a low and bleak line of white hills, a spur from the Ma'lûla range which strikes out half an hour south of Yabrûd. After passing through extensive vineyards and fields of madder, we reached Yabrûd at 2.52.

Our route hence to Ma'lûla was the same we had pursued last year; and we rested for a few minutes at the same fountain in the glen, where we had before eaten our noonday meal.

The sun had set and the short twilight of this eastern land had given place to the gloom of night when we knocked at the convent gate of Ma'lûla. On the very same day and about the same hour, we knocked here twelve months ago. On the 19th of October, 1852, Mr. Barnett and I visited this place in company with Mr. Robson; and now, on the 19th of October, 1853, we find ourselves here again, admitted by the same deacon, and welcomed by the same jolly old friar. The same servant who then accompanied us, was with us now, and none is wanting to complete the old party, save Mr. Robson. He, however, was separated from us by broad seas, and broader lands; having returned on a visit to his native country.

Thursday, Oct. 20th. The road from Ma'lûla to Damascus, by way of Saidanâya, I had before travelled. That by way of Kuteifeh and Adhr'a I had also passed over; and I now determined to take a road between these two; crossing first the plain of 'Ain et-Tneh, and then skirting the southern extremity of the mountain range that divides this plain from that of Jerûd, pass over the Menin range into the Sahara.

Descending from the convent, we entered the gorge on the north side. This sublime pass I had formerly seen from the mountain summit; but I now found the estimate I had formed of its grandeur was far short of the reality. At first, the walls of rock on each side are low, but they soon increase in altitude until they attain an elevation of some 200 feet. The space between the cliffs is in many places not more than three, and seldom exceeds seven feet. The sides are jagged and irregular, the one being an exact impression of the other; thus showing that in former times the mountain was, by some wondrous power, rent to its foundations, and in this way opened up. About the centre of the pass, a huge mass of rock has become detached from the cliff overhead, and has fallen to near the bottom; but ere it reached it, it became wedged, and thus it now hangs threateningly overhead as one passes underneath. A descent of a few feet more would have entirely blocked up the passage. While winding through the narrow defile, I could scarce refrain from shuddering, on looking upward at the gradually narrowing opening, with its projecting angles, and apparently tottering summits. Towards the lower part the gap expands; but enormous masses of rock have fallen down, and almost fill up the cavity. On emerging, a scene of considerable beauty and gran-

deur suddenly opens in front. Close on the left is the picturesque convent of St. Thecla, built almost wholly within a large natural cave or fissure in the precipice. On the right is the village; its houses perched on the steep slope at the foot of the high ledge on which the upper convent stands; while beyond rises a cliff loftier and more rugged still, whose sides, as well as those of all the others around, are actually honey-combed with ancient sepulchral caves. In the centre is a sweet vale, clothed with the dark green foliage of the walnut and mulberry; among which broken columns and crumbling ruins may be here and there seen. A tradition exists, that this place was called *Lao-dicea* in ancient times; and the superior informed us, that the upper convent was 1987 years old! On being asked if there had been a convent here before the days of our Saviour, "Of course," was his learned reply.

We left the village at 9 o'clock, and rode down the vale through beautiful fields and orchards. Passing a grove of very ancient pistachio trees, we reached the village of 'Ain et-Tneh at 9.32; our course having been S. 23 E. This vale continues in the same direction to the pass in the mountain range, through which the Aleppo road runs to the plain of Kuteifeh. The inhabitants of 'Ain et-Tneh are now all Muslims; more than half of those in Ma'lûla are Muslims also; and the whole population of the little village of Bukha. Yet they all speak Syriac, and their forefathers were, some two centuries ago, members of the ancient Syrian church; and, though they have embraced the faith of Islam, yet the peculiar family names are preserved, and their marriage customs are the same as those of the communities of Hums and Sûdûd.

On leaving the village we turned to the right and followed a straight course across the plain, S. 10 W. There is here much more cultivated land than I had formerly thought. At 10.28 we reached a strip of fine land running along the base of the mountain range. Turning to the right we rode down the little plain in a straight line without any path, S. 75 W., till at 10.50 we reached a valley between a little group of hills in the plain, and the southern extremity of the mountain range on the left. Here resuming our former course, we passed the end of the mountains, among orchards of fig-trees. The great plain of Jerûd now opened up before us on the left; and that village itself, with its extensive salt marsh, was clearly seen glittering in the sun.

The gardens of Ruhaibeh and Mu'addamtyeh were also visible; and somewhat nearer, the lofty minaret of the Khân at Kuteifeh. At 11.5 we reached a small village called Hileh, of which I had never before heard. It is built in a shallow Wady in the midst of an undulating plain. From it I took the following bearings: summit of Tintyeh, S. 22 E.; top of Jebel Shurabîn, N. 87 W.

After a delay of five minutes, we continued in the same course over a rising ground, and entered in ten minutes a fertile plain of considerable extent. Turning now to the right, S. 70 W., we followed a straight road over the plain, and then passing some low chalky hills we reached Hafîr at 12.20. This village is situated on the southern slope of a beautiful and well-watered vale. The dark green foliage of the orchards that line the valley, forms a pleasing contrast to the dazzling whiteness of the swelling hills around. The water runs in a deep Wady towards the rocky ridge on the east; but I could see no opening for it into the Sahra. From hence we rode in a course about S. 35 W., crossing diagonally a little valley that runs up the centre of the Menin range from the parallel of Bedda to the plain at Hileh. It is well cultivated, and extensive vineyards cover its sides. At one o'clock we reached the brow of the Menin range, overlooking the plain of Sahra. From this point we saw Saidanâya away on our right, N. 75 W.; while before us the eastern portion of the Sahra was spread out like a map. On the left, beyond it, rose the steep and naked sides of Jebel Tintyeh. Descending the slope diagonally, we reached in forty minutes the little village of Hafeiyr. Beside it is a fine fountain, the stream from which runs down a narrow valley, to the low line of hills; there it passes by a deep gorge, and enters the plain of Damascus. It was from this stream, I believe, that the ancient aqueduct, which is now seen along the southern side of these hills, in former times derived its supply of water.

Resuming our journey at 1.48, we rode along a fine road with cultivated and tolerably fertile ground on each side. Our course was, as before, S. 25 W.; but in twenty minutes we began to turn gradually to the left, along the side of the little Wady that descends from Ma'rûneh. Following its course, we passed through a ridge of hills, and entered a valley that runs up the centre of this lowest range to the foot of Tintyeh. Crossing this we entered a deep and wild ravine, the sides of which rise up steep and rocky on the right and left; and, after some fifteen minutes

winding, emerged once more on the plain of Damascus. The old aqueduct is, at this point, nearly perfect. It is carried across the opening of this Wady on an embankment of hewn stones; two fine arches spanning the central part.

We now turned our horses' heads to the city. In fifteen minutes we passed the fine fountain of Kusair. Our way now led through extensive vineyards to the large village of Dûma, which we reached at 3.50. We soon after struck the Aleppo road, and entered the gates of Damascus at six o'clock.

This, I fear, is the last journey I may be privileged to make for a long season. Since my return I have been almost a prisoner in my house. When I venture abroad, I am assailed with insult and threats by the fanatical Muslims. The aggressions of Russia have roused their ancient spirit of tyranny; and it will be well if they do not wreak their vengeance on the unoffending Christians in this city. We consider it as no small grievance, that, while English fleets are contributing to support the Sultan on his tottering throne, English subjects should be exposed to the grossest abuse in the streets of one of his principal cities.

Damascus, December 24th, 1853.

ARTICLE II.

OUR SAVIOUR'S DISCOURSE IN THE SYNAGOGUE AT CAPERNAUM.

By E. P. Barrows, Professor at Andover.

Of the remarkable discourse addressed by our Lord to the Jews in the synagogue at Capernaum (John 6: 25—65), in which he exhibits himself in his personality as "the living bread which came down from heaven," and teaches that eternal life is to be received only by eating his flesh and drinking his blood, the words of the Apostle to the Corinthians: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are

spiritually discerned,"¹ hold good in a preëminent sense. In their interpretation, everything depends on a true apprehension of Christ's person and office, and the relation which believers hold to him. If any man be right here, his eye is single, and, as he reads, his whole body will be full of light. But if he have a wrong view of Christ's character and the work of redemption committed to him by the Father, his eye is evil, and his whole body will be full of darkness. Mere learning and genius will avail but little for the apprehension of a passage that has to do throughout with the inward spiritual relation that subsists between the Redeemer and his disciples. The first and main question must be: Who is Christ, and what is his office? It will not be inappropriate, therefore, in attempting an exposition of the passage under consideration, to discuss this question somewhat at large. We, accordingly, divide the present Article into two parts: the discussion of the ground-idea that underlies the whole passage, which can be no other than the ground-idea of Christ's person and office; and the exposition of the passage itself.

I. OUR LORD'S PERSON AND OFFICE IN THEIR RELATION TO THE BELIEVER.

"Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?"² This is the question which Jesus proposed to his disciples in the region of Caesarea Philippi. The answer to it was then, and will ever remain, the great problem of Christianity. On this occasion the disciples replied: "Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets."³ Again the Lord asked: "But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."⁴ Our Lord's reply to this confession of Peter: "Blessed art thou, Simon, Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven,"⁵ is full of weighty instruction. It teaches us that our blessedness depends on a correct apprehension of his person and office, and that for this apprehension we need a heavenly illumination, such as no mere human instruction can give. It will be noticed that the apostles, in enumerating the various opinions

¹ 1 Cor. 2: 14.² Matt. 16: 15.³ Matt. 16: 14.⁴ Matt. 16: 15, 16.⁵ Matt. 16: 17.

concerning Christ, omitted those of his malignant enemies who said: "He hath a devil, and is mad, why hear ye him?"¹ "He casteth out devils through Beelzebub, the chief of the devils;"² because these were unworthy of notice, having their foundation, not in any rational conviction, but only in hatred and prejudice. We propose, in the present discussion, to imitate their example, confining ourselves to those views of Christ's person and office, which are maintained by such as acknowledge him to be a true religious teacher. And, that we may not proceed at random, but according to some fixed rules that shall conduct us, when faithfully followed, to certain results, we think it wise to state explicitly at the outset the two great criteria of truth in this investigation.

First. The true view of Christ's person and office will harmonize all the different statements of Scripture respecting him. We do not mean that it will explain all that is mysterious in his nature and the manner of our receiving redemption through him, but that it will agree with all the great facts pertaining to his character and work which the word of God sets forth. This rule needs no demonstration, for it has its foundation in the common sense of mankind. And its adequacy will be manifest to any one who considers how numerous and how diversified are the Scriptural statements respecting both Christ's person and his work. The traveller, who holds in his hand a correct map of North America, with a full description of its various towns, rivers, and ranges of mountains, and faithfully uses it, need not go far astray. Certainly he will not mistake the road to St. Louis for that to New Orleans, nor find himself in Charleston in endeavoring to reach Halifax. If he is pursuing the right course, it will be certified to him all along the road by numerous agreements between what he finds written and described in his guide and what he sees before his eyes. But if he is out of the way, everything around him will be wrong. His only way of making out an agreement will be that of the perpetual perversion of descriptions and falsification of distances. Throughout his whole journey he must put miles for furlongs, and furlongs for miles; convert brick walls into granite columns, square towers into lofty spires, and level plains into rugged mountains; and this only to arrive at last where he

¹ John 10: 20.² Luke 11: 15.

would not. Now the descriptions which the Bible gives us of Christ's person and office, are so full and various, and they view him and his work on so many different sides, that we have in them an adequate guide to the solution of the great question: "Who is this Son of man?" The right view will be in constant harmony with the testimony of Scripture; the wrong view, in perpetual disagreement with it, leading, as the certain result, to scepticism in respect to the authority of the record, and forced interpretations of its contents.

Secondly. The true view of Christ's person and office will *satisfy the deep spiritual wants of the soul.* Certain it is that the holy Scriptures offer us in Christ a perfect Saviour, one who is able to meet all our necessities as sinners, and is, therefore, worthy of our unlimited confidence. Their constant testimony concerning Jesus is, that "he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him."¹ If, then, we adopt a view of his character and work that leaves our deepest necessities unprovided for, we want no other proof that it is false; for the Saviour whom God has provided for sinners, will surely be able to meet and satisfy all their wants.

Taking these two simple rules for our guidance, let us examine some of the views that have been held respecting Christ's person and office.

1. The lowest of these views is that which recognizes in Jesus of Nazareth only *a human teacher*; a great and good teacher, but still a teacher invested with no Divine authority, and whose doctrines and precepts are all to be subjected to the crucible of human reason, and received or rejected accordingly. Of this view it is enough to say, that it is in open contradiction to our Lord's own declarations concerning himself, and that it gives us no sure foundation for our faith. He constantly affirmed that he came in God's name and acted by his authority. "The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me. And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me."² "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me. And he that seeth me, seeth him that sent me."³ "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should

¹ Heb. 7: 25.² John 5: 36, 37.³ John 12: 44, 45.

say, and what I should speak."¹ These words, which are but specimens of our Lord's constant doctrine concerning his relation to the Father, are absolutely conclusive. They prove that, if he was a good and upright man, he was a teacher sent from God, and commissioned to speak and act in his name.

2. The next view is that which acknowledges in Christ a teacher sent from God, but still *only a teacher, with no Divine nature*, and, consequently, *in no proper sense a Redeemer*. According to this view, our Lord's office is all comprehended in the work of bearing witness to the truth, first by his doctrines, secondly, by his example. His doctrine was a bright revelation of truth; his life, a bright example of conformity to truth; his death, the seal which he affixed to his testimony in behalf of the truth; and here his mission ended.

According to this view, the relation of believers to Christ is only that of obedient and confiding pupils to their master. He is their *head* in the same sense in which Socrates was the head of his followers, the only difference being that Christ was a more perfect teacher than Socrates. The *union* between Christ and his true disciples, upon which the Scriptures so much insist, and which they describe in such strong terms, is reduced to a simple *moral* union — a harmony of views and feelings such as exists between all good teachers and good disciples. Of a proper redemption this view can know nothing, for it acknowledges neither a propitiation for sin through the blood of Christ, nor a Divine influence proceeding from him into the human soul, which quickens its moral perceptions, illuminates it in the knowledge of God and of itself, renews it in holiness, and thus restores it to communion with God and makes it victorious over sin. Whatever help Christ bestows upon his disciples in the work of making them "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light," is exhausted in that of precept and example.

If now we try this opinion concerning Christ's person and the relation which he holds to his followers, by the two canons that have been laid down, we shall find it alike condemned by both.

First. It is *at variance with the whole tenor of the New Testament*, which constantly represents Christ as holding to his disciples another, and a far higher relation than that of a mere

¹ John 12: 49.

teacher and witness for the truth. How utterly irreconcilable it is with our Lord's discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum, will be shown hereafter. Not to insist now upon the very remarkable view which this discourse, in common with the institution of the eucharist, gives of the relation which subsists between Christ and his followers, and which has ever been a stumbling-block to those who fail to recognize in him a Divine Redeemer, there are many other representations whose depth and fulness of meaning cannot possibly be exhausted in the simple idea of a teacher and pattern of holiness. Thus he describes himself as opening in the soul a fountain of living water. "Whosoever," says he to the woman of Samaria, "drinketh of this water, shall thirst again: but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life."¹ "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." And "this," the Evangelist adds, "spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive."² Again, he represents himself as the vine, and his disciples as the branches that receive from him all their life, nourishment and fruitfulness. "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."³ Once more, he is the resurrection and the life. "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."⁴

Not to mention, further, those numerous passages which represent Christ as having given his life a ransom for sin; as being invested by the Father with all power in heaven and in earth; and as appointed by him to be the final Judge of all men, let any one seriously weigh the import of these declara-

¹ John 4: 13, 14. ² John 7: 37—39. ³ John 15: 4—6. ⁴ John 11: 25, 26.

tions of Christ concerning himself which have just been enumerated, and he must feel that their deep meaning cannot be exhausted in the simple idea of a teacher and witness for the truth. This will, perhaps, appear more clearly, if we make the supposition that such language should be employed by any merely human teacher. Consider the incongruity, not to say blasphemy, of declarations like these proceeding from the lips of Isaiah, or Peter, or Paul! How could either of these men, nay more, how could the angel Gabriel, presume to say: "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." "He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." "I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me, ye can do nothing." These words were manifestly intended to convey the idea that he had in himself unlimited power to help and save, and demanded of men their unlimited confidence.

But for the possession of such power, demanding of men such confidence, there must be an adequate ground; and that ground can be no other than an unlimited, that is to say, a Divine nature. That which is in itself finite and dependent, cannot receive and exercise an unlimited endowment, and become itself the centre of universal dependence. Here we wish neither to deny nor conceal the fact that the Scriptures uniformly represent Christ as *receiving* from the Father his office in all its parts. He comes into the world not of himself, but the Father sends him, and his doctrine and works are not his own, but those of the Father. "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself."¹ "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak."² "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself,³ but what he

¹ John 7: 16, 17.

² John 12: 49, 50.

³ *ἀπ' ἑαυτοῦ*; "suapte arbitrata," of his own will, in contrast with what he

seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, that also doeth the Son likewise."¹ Among the works which the Father has committed to him to do, our Lord names, in immediate connection, those of raising the dead and judging all men. "As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son."² "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man."³ And, finally, he represents himself as having received from the Father "all power in heaven and in earth,"⁴ an investiture which includes in itself all the particular offices above enumerated.

And because Christ is thus sent by the Father with a commission what to do and teach, it follows, even without the direct Scriptural statement of the fact, that he is *subordinate* to the Father, since, without contradiction, he who sends is greater than he who is sent. The attempt to explain such declarations of our Lord as the following: "My Father is greater than I,"⁵ on the simple ground of his humanity, would be, in our apprehension, entirely unsatisfactory; for his subordination to the Father, as the *receiver* to the *giver*, extends to those offices that are manifestly above the capacity of a finite nature. Of that subordination of the Son to the Father which runs through all the Scriptural representations concerning him, we have no new explanation to give; for we regard the old explanation, that of *official investiture*, as abundantly sufficient. The Son *receives* from the Father his mediatorial office in all its parts;⁶ he acts *under him*, and *by his authority*, and is thus *less* than the Father, not merely as "the man Christ Jesus," but also as "God manifest in the flesh." But the question still remains: How can any

does in accordance with the Father's will, and by his authority. The words do not mean, as we shall presently see, that the Son can do nothing by virtue of a power that resides in himself and is properly his own.

¹ John 5: 19.

² John 5: 21, 22.

³ John 5: 26, 27.

⁴ Matt. 28: 18.

⁵ John 14: 28.

⁶ It is not to the eternal Word that "was in the beginning with God," and "was God," that the mediatorship between God and man pertains; but to this Word "made flesh." Our Lord's divine nature had no beginning, and could not possibly be a subject of divine constitution. But his mediatorial office as "the man Christ Jesus" had a beginning. He received it of the Father when he "came forth from the Father, and came into the world."

but a Divine being *receive* the office which the Father commits to the Son?

"The Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." The office, then, which the Son holds, as the judge of ~~all~~ men, is not one which he has of himself, but one which has been committed to him by the Father. He exercises it, not in his own name, but in that of the Father, and under his authority. But the office of judging "the quick and the dead," judging them for the purpose of determining their destiny for eternity, implies the original capacity to search the hearts of all men. Accordingly the Lord Jesus claims for himself, along with the power of life and death, this attribute: "And I will kill her children with death; and all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works."¹ But the capacity of searching the secrets of the heart; not some particular secret of a particular heart, but all the secrets of all hearts; is, if any other, Divine and incommunicable.

Again: "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself."² And, in accordance with this gift, "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will."³ The Father has life in himself as the original possessor and author of life, who gives life to whom he will. In this respect, he has made the Son equal with himself. He too has "life in himself," and "quickeneth whom he will." It is manifest that our Lord here speaks, not of the bestowment of a capacity, but of an official investiture with the office of having life in himself to be bestowed at his own pleasure upon whom he will, which implies a previously existing capacity to receive such an office. And this capacity can be nothing else than a Divine nature, originally possessing life, in and of itself. The eternal Word who "was in the beginning with God," and "was God," "was made flesh and dwelt among us." It was in this twofold manifestation, as "the Son of God" and "the Son of man," that he undertook the mediatorial office, and received from the Father authority, as Mediator, to judge all men, and to give life natural and spiritual to whom he would.⁴

¹ Rev. 2: 23.

² John 5: 26.

³ John 5: 21.

⁴ To the same purport Calvin. Having said, commentary on John 5: 26: "The meaning of the words is this, that God did not wish to have life hidden

Finally, and to sum up in one all the offices of Christ: he has received from the Father "all power in heaven and in earth." But this, again, implies the original capacity to exercise "all power in heaven and in earth," which can be no other than a Divine capacity.

In entire accordance with this view, our Lord uniformly represents himself as performing his mighty works by a power that resides in himself and is properly his own. The authority to perform them he has received from the Father, for they are "the works which the Father hath given" him "to do;"¹ but he is himself, in the true and proper sense, their author. Not so his apostles. They do not, in and of their own power, work miracles by virtue of a commission received from God; but God, by his power, works miracles through them, miracles of which they are in no proper sense the authors, and the efficiency of which they are careful to ascribe to God. So Peter said to the lame man: "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk;"² and, afterwards, to the wondering multitude: "Why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk?"³ and again: "Aeneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole."⁴ He carefully turned away men's confidence from his own person to Christ. But Jesus everywhere speaks and acts as one who claims from men unlimited confidence in himself. He does not say: "My Father maketh thee whole;" or "My Father forgiveth thy sins;" but "Thy sins be forgiven thee;" "Arise and walk." He is careful to have it understood that the forgiving and healing power proceeds from himself as its proper source. His prayer at the grave of Lazarus constitutes no exception. For this was not for power to do that which he had no ability to do in and of himself; but, as he himself explained, for the sake of the bystanders, that they might believe that the Father had sent him.⁵ Thus the malignant accusation of the scribes and pharisees, that he wrought his miracles by virtue of a power received from Satan, was effectually cut off, and it was demonstrated to all that he acted in God's name and by his authority.

and, as it were, buried with himself (*apud se*); and he accordingly transferred it into the Son, that it might flow to us;" he adds: "Hence we infer that this title is properly ascribed to Christ so far as he is manifested in the flesh (*quatenus in carne manifestatus est*)."

¹ John 5: 36. ² Acts 3: 6. ³ Acts 3: 12. ⁴ Acts 9: 34. ⁵ John 11: 42.

So far, then, is the Scriptural representation that Christ *receives* from the Father his office, and is thus *less* than the Father, from proving that he does not possess a Divine nature, that, on the contrary, the very nature of the office committed to him implies the previous possession of that divinity which is in so many passages expressly assigned to him. But if he be Divine, he must be equal with the Father in power and glory, since divinity admits of no degrees; and also, one with the Father, since God is one. The view that recognizes in Christ only a teacher sent from God, with no Divine nature, is thus found to be utterly inconsistent with our first rule of judgment, namely, that the true view of Christ's person and office will harmonize the different statements of Scripture respecting him.

Secondly. It is equally at variance with our second rule, that the true view of Christ's person and office will satisfy the deep spiritual wants of the soul. That Christ is, in the highest sense, a teacher sent from God, is one of the first truths of the New Testament. And one of the very first effects of his teaching is to convince men that they need something beyond mere light and instruction. The more they learn, under the illumination of his Word and Spirit, of God and of themselves, the deeper and more distressing is their sense of guilt that needs some better propitiation than they are able to offer to God, and of inward corruption that needs for its removal some higher power than their own unaided strength. It is precisely they who have the truest apprehension of their condition as sinners, that feel most deeply their need of a helper who shall be not only a teacher, but also a Redeemer, and a Redeemer who has unlimited fulness of power both to expiate sin and to deliver the soul from its dominion.

Since, then, that view of Christ's person and office which regards him as simply a divinely commissioned teacher and witness for the truth, fails to meet the deep spiritual wants of the soul in the same proportion in which they are truly apprehended, it must be false. It is, in truth, a view, which is compatible only with superficial ideas concerning the majesty and spirituality of God's law, on the one side, and on the other, of man's guilty and helpless condition as a violator of that law. It has its roots in self-ignorance and ignorance of God; and for this reason nothing is so fatal to it as that true inward experience of the malignant nature and terrible power of sin which comes

through a Scriptural apprehension of God's character. "I was alive without the law once," says the Apostle, "but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death."¹ Why find the commandment "to be unto death," if all he needed was to be taught what it was? The Apostle himself furnishes the answer: "When the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." The knowledge of the commandment brought to his soul an awful sense of guilt, but it gave neither expiation for sin nor deliverance from its power. It showed him that he was ruined, and there it left him, crying: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"² It was this apprehension of his lost condition — not the discovery that he wanted more light, but, through light already received, that he needed a Redeemer — which led Paul to Christ. Thus we are naturally brought to the true view of our Saviour's person and office, which is:

3. The view that regards him as a *Divine Redeemer*. This includes both his *person* and his *office*. In his person he is "God manifest in the flesh," and his office is to "save his people from their sins;" save them in every respect in which they need salvation. The moment that we apprehend Christ as a *Divine Redeemer in the person of the eternal Word made flesh*, every declaration concerning him, in both the Old and the New Testament, falls into its right place, and becomes natural and appropriate; and we become, at the same time, delightfully conscious that in him we have found the Almighty Helper whom our souls need, a haven where our tempest-tossed spirits can cast anchor and find rest "sure and steadfast." Here, then, we have both the criteria of truth, which we found to be both wanting in the former views. Christ offers himself not only as an all-sufficient teacher, to show us our duty, but also as an all-sufficient Redeemer to deliver us from our sins. The salvation which he offers is a complete salvation. It extends to all our wants, and satisfies them all; so that in him we find the very Saviour set forth in God's word as "able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him?"³ No view of the redemption which God offers us through his Son is more animating than this of its comprehensiveness. Its provisions cover the whole ground of our fallen condition, and meet all its necessities.

¹ Rom. 7: 9, 10.² Rom. 7: 24.³ Heb. 7: 25.

The gift of the Holy Spirit is itself the fruit of Christ's redemption, and he leads the soul to Christ for help. One of the first effects of his illuminating influence is a sense of guilt, which becomes the more deep and distressing the more we learn of God's infinite purity, and of the comprehensiveness and spirituality of his law. This sense of guilt, when it comes through the study of God's word, carries with itself the evidence that it is no fantasy, but a dreadful reality; and it sets us at once upon the inquiry: "How shall I make my peace with God?" It is only the ignorant and light-minded that can here think of their supposed good works. In the same degree in which we have a true and deep apprehension of God's wrath as resting upon our souls, do we also feel our inability to lift off from them the dreadful burden. To know, through the revelation of God's Word and Spirit, that we are under condemnation as sinners, is to know that we can offer to God no propitiation for our sins. Thus the way is prepared for a revelation to the soul of Christ's atoning sacrifice; and the deeper our sense of guilt, the more glorious does this revelation appear. It rises upon the tempest-tossed soul like a clear morning after a dark and tempestuous night. Here is help, indeed, laid by God himself upon one that is mighty. God himself "has loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins,"¹ and he cannot but accept the atonement which his own grace has provided. The great question of justification before God is solved by his own act in setting forth Jesus Christ "to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," "that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus."² How does the sinner, whose soul has been pressed down to the earth under a sense of guilt, exult in having found a way of justification that stands not on the ground of his own merit, but of God's sovereign grace! And, as he advances in the Divine life, he is constantly making new discoveries of his exceeding sinfulness, such as must utterly overwhelm him and drive him to despair, were it not that God, at the same time, makes corresponding revelations of the infinite fulness of Christ's atoning sacrifice; so that, while he is continually sinking deeper in self-abasement, his confidence in Christ's redemption rises higher and higher. He is emptied of self-righteousness that he may be filled with the fulness of Christ's righteousness.

¹ 1 John 4: 10.² Rom. 3: 25, 26.

Another feeling which always accompanies the sense of guilt awakened in the soul by God's Spirit, and which grows with its growth, is that of moral impotence. If the convicted sinner sees that he can offer to God no satisfaction for his sins, he sees, also, with equal clearness, his inability, without the help of God's grace, to deliver himself from their power. It is only they who are profoundly ignorant of God's law and of themselves that can imagine the work of turning inwardly and outwardly from sin to holiness to be one that is to be accomplished by their own unaided power as free agents, whenever it shall suit their convenience. He who has made the discovery that God's law is "spiritual," extending to his inmost thoughts and affections, has learned also that he is "carnal, sold under sin,"¹ and that a mightier arm than his own is needed to break off his fetters, and set his soul at liberty. It is true that, in yielding himself to the dominion of sin, he is consciously free; and it is precisely this that makes his condition so dreadful. Were his sin necessitated, he might plead this in self-justification. But now he is inwardly conscious that the same faculties which he gives to the world he has power to give to his Maker; that, in choosing the service of Mammon rather than of Christ, he acts as a free responsible being; that neither God, nor man, nor Satan compels the choice, but that it is his own proper act for which he will be justly held responsible at the last day. But, with this full consciousness of freedom and responsibility, he becomes more and more convinced of the impotence of his will in respect to everything good — its moral, not its natural impotence — till he comes at last to feel, in the very centre of his being, that, unless God interpose, sin will have dominion over him, and that, if the question be whether he shall, by his own proper power unaided from above, lift his soul out of the pit of corruption in which it is sunk, and raise it up to holiness and communion with God, his case is absolutely hopeless, as much so as if he were already in the pit of despair. Thus is he forced to cry out: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"² And to the man who sends up to heaven this prayer from the inmost depths of his spirit, it is vain to offer a Saviour who is no more than a teacher and witness for the truth. It is the knowledge of the truth which has shown him his helplessness

¹ Rom. 7: 14.² Rom. 7: 24.

condition and filled his soul with the blackness of despair. He needs redemption from the indwelling power of sin, not less than from the curse of God's broken law; and such redemption God offers him through Christ in the gift of his Spirit. And how glorious does this grace appear in the hour of the soul's extremity! Christ offers himself to the sinner as his sanctification, not less than his justification; as one who can and will make all who come to him in faith, victorious over the inward corruption of their hearts, and raise them at last to the perfect purity and blessedness of heaven.

These two provisions of Christ's redemption, pardon and sanctification, include in themselves all other needed blessings, guidance, discipline, protection, support, comfort, and the everlasting fruition of heaven. "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?"¹ They who have learned to depend on Christ for pardon and sanctification, have learned that in him all fulness dwells. They daily lean their whole soul upon him with holy composure and gladness, and are filled with the delightful assurance that in him all their wants are satisfied. Christ lives in their souls, as the centre about which their warm affections cluster, and without their souls in their daily life. Now they need no human teacher to expound to them the meaning of those strong figures by which the holy Scriptures set forth the union between Christ and his disciples, and the quickening power that flows from him through this union, into their souls. They have themselves drank of the water that Christ gives, and it has become in their souls "a well of water springing up into everlasting life,"² and flowing out thence in "rivers of living water."³ They have become branches of the true vine, and they feel the life-giving current flowing from it through their whole being, and making them green and fruitful.

It is from this position alone that we can rightly understand and interpret our Lord's discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum. The ground-idea which underlies it throughout is: *Christ in his personality, the life and sustenance of the soul.* Throughout the whole address our Lord draws the confidence of his hearers

¹ Rom. 8: 32.² John 4: 14.³ John 7: 38.

to his own person, as the centre whence flows forth the redemption of both soul and body. He does not occupy himself, as did the prophets before him, with directing them to God for salvation (though this he might have done, for in the work of redemption he and the Father are one¹), but he sets forth himself, as having in himself life, and giving life to all that come to him. And he not only calls himself "the living bread which came down from heaven," of which all who eat shall live forever, but he particularizes his flesh and his blood: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."² Thus, while he makes the idea of faith in his person more certain and prominent, he also foreshadows, as will be shown hereafter, the great idea of the eucharist, which is: *Christ crucified, the life and sustenance of the soul.*

The true view of Christ as a *Divine Redeemer* who has made propitiation for sin through his blood; who, through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, cleanses the heart from the pollution of sin; and who will, at the last day, raise the bodies of all who believe on him in glory; so that in him we have pardon, sanctification, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting; this view of Christ's person and office makes the language of the discourse under consideration natural and appropriate. It is the very language in which the believer who knows Christ as his Redeemer loves to express the fulness of his confidence in him, and the completeness of the salvation which he receives through him. But to the man who has been unable to discern in Christ anything more than a great and good teacher, sent by God to instruct him concerning his duty, it must appear both exaggerated and incongruous. A strange way, truly, of conveying the simple idea: Except ye listen to my doctrine, ye cannot know the truth and be saved by it; so strange that, if Christ be only a teacher, and not a Divine Redeemer, one might be excused for saying: "This is an hard saying; who can hear it?"

¹ Compare John 10: 27—30: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one;" where the salvation of believers is ascribed to the joint act of the Father and the Son.

² John 10: 54, 55.

II. EXPOSITION OF THE DISCOURSE.

The historic events that gave occasion to this remarkable discourse, are familiar to our readers, and need not be stated in detail. Our Saviour had miraculously fed a great multitude in the desert region that borders the north-east coast of the Sea of Galilee.¹ Under the immediate impression of this miracle, the people were ready to "take him by force, to make him a king."² To avoid this, Jesus retired "into a mountain himself alone;" and, in the course of the following night, miraculously joined his disciples, who had sailed for Capernaum, by walking on the sea. The day following, the people, finding that both Jesus and his disciples had departed, followed him to Capernaum, where they found him teaching in the synagogue.

V. 25. And when they had found him on the other side of the sea, they said unto him: Rabbi, when camest thou hither?

"The other side of the sea" is here the western side, to which they had just returned from "the desert place, belonging to the city called Bethsaida." Their question implies wonder at the unexplained manner of our Lord's passage. They had been present when the disciples embarked without him, and yet there was no other boat in the place.

V. 26. Jesus answered them, and said: Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled.

The words *εἶδετε σημεῖα* (*σημεῖα* without the article) should be rendered: *ye saw signs*. They contain a general reference to his miracles which the multitudes had witnessed. Our Lord does not mean to deny that they had, in some sense, been moved to follow him by the sight of his miracles; but he teaches that it was not the miracles themselves that attracted them, but only the earthly good which they had received from them. The true end of Christ's miracles was to manifest his Divine glory, and

¹ It was "a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida" (Luke 9: 10), which lay in Gaulonites, at the north-eastern extremity of the lake, near the entrance of the Jordan.

² V. 15. *Ἀρπάξεν αὐτόν, to seize and bear him off in triumph; the appropriate word for such an act.* Tacitus, Hist. L. I. Cap. 29.

thus draw men to himself as their divinely constituted Teacher and Lord. But these men valued them only for the loaves and fishes which they had furnished, and they sought in Jesus only a minister to their earthly wants.

V. 27. Work¹ not for the food which perisheth, but for the food which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you; for him hath God the Father sealed.

Ἔργασθαι, with the Acc., is here, *to gain by labor*. The uniform doctrine of the Scriptures is, that, while salvation is a gift of God's free grace, the condition of our receiving it is that we labor for it. So in the book of Proverbs we are exhorted, if we would find knowledge, to seek her as silver, and search for her as for hid treasures, because "the Lord giveth wisdom;"² and the Apostle's injunction is: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure."³ — *The food which perisheth*, is food whose nourishing power perishes; and which cannot, therefore, give eternal life. To this is opposed *the food which endureth unto everlasting life* — food which has power to give everlasting life to those who partake of it. — *To seal*, is here, *to certify*; that is, to attest as the Messiah. God sealed Jesus as the Messiah both by his testimony at his baptism,⁴ and by the Divine works which he commissioned him to perform.⁵

Our Lord advances slowly, and by several successive steps, to the full development of the great doctrine: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life."⁶ The present verse contains his first position: The Son of man has for all who will come to him, food that endureth unto everlasting life. He does not yet exhibit his *person* as "the bread of life," but only declares that he has this bread to bestow upon men. The occasion of this figure, which he unfolds with such Divine grandeur and majesty, rising continually higher in his representations of himself, was the perishable bread wherewith he had fed the multitude on the other side of the sea. Thus he sought to raise their low and earthly minds to the pursuit of spiritual good.

¹ *Ἔργασθαι*. By rendering "*Labor not*," our translators have obscured the connection between this exhortation and the question in the verse following.

² Prov. 2: 3—6.

³ Phil. 2: 12, 13.

⁴ Matt. 3: 17, al.

⁵ John 5: 36.

⁶ V. 54.

V. 28. They said, therefore, unto him : What shall we do that we may work the works of God ?

The works of God, are works which he requires and approves. Jesus had just exhorted the multitude to work for the food which endureth unto everlasting life. They correctly understood him to be speaking figuratively of a religious service which God will reward with eternal life; but, in accordance with their legal notions, they thought at once of some particular outward duties. The plural number is not without significance. It points to "the broken manifoldness of legal works."¹

V. 29. Jesus answered and said unto them : This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.

He calls off their thoughts from the multiplicity of outward legal observances, through which they had been taught to seek salvation, to the one inward and spiritual work of faith in himself; a work which comprises in itself the sum of all that God requires.

Vs. 30. 31. They said, therefore, unto him : What sign showest thou then, that we may see and believe thee ? what dost thou work ? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert ; as it is written : He gave them bread from heaven to eat.

Nothing can more forcibly illustrate the truth of our Lord's declaration : " Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled," than this reply to his demand of faith in himself. If his miracles had made on their minds a true impression, by revealing to them his Divine character and mission, then would they have been ready to receive him, and submit themselves to his authority. But in the Saviour's mighty works they had seen and admired, not his glory, but only the gratification of their earthly desires. Now that he attempts to call them away from earthly to spiritual good, they at once deny his claim to their faith and obedience. Here the words of Calvin are very pertinent : " If Christ had offered them hope of earthly felicity, they would have greeted him with continued applause ; he would have been saluted by them without controversy as Prophet, and Messiah, and Son of God ; now, because he rebukes them for being too much given to the flesh, they do not think him worthy of being further listened to."²—

¹ Die zersplitterte Vielheit der Gesetzwerte.—*De Wette*, in loco.

² Commentary on John, in loco.

What sign showest thou then, that we may see and believe? They set aside the miracles which they had already witnessed, as incompetent to prove his Messiahship, and demand of him a sign of a different character; namely, a sign from heaven, which the pharisees also demanded.¹—*What dost thou work?* that is, what work that may claim our faith in thee as the Messiah.—*Our fathers did eat manna in the desert.* This seems to be an indirect way of demanding from Jesus a repetition of the miracle of the manna. And this is made more probable by the Jewish tradition that the Messiah should renew this wonder, which may be found in all the collections of Rabbinic doctrines. We quote from Schöttgen:

“Midrash Coheleth, fol. 73, 3. Rabbi Berechia has said in the name of Rabbi Isaac: As was the first Redeemer [Moses], so also shall be the last. The first Redeemer caused manna to descend (הוריד את המן); as is said, Ex. 16: 4: *And I will rain bread from heaven for you.* So also the last Redeemer causes manna to descend, as is said, Ps. 72: 16: *There shall be a multitude of corn upon the earth.*”² They lay stress on the fact that the manna descended from heaven: *He gave them bread from heaven to eat.*³ Thus they represent the manna as a sign from heaven, in contrast with the Saviour's miracles, which were only earthly signs. In this objection of the multitude we have a perfect embodiment of the spirit of unbelief, which is always captious and unreasonable, demanding, not simply evidence of a solid and satisfactory character, but such evidence as it chooses to prescribe.

¹ Matt. 16: 1. Mark 8: 11.

² Midrasch Coheleth, fol. 73, 3. R. Berechia nomine R. Isaac dixit: *Quem- admodum Goël primus, sic quoque erit postremus. Goël primus (הוריד את המן) descendere fecit Man, q. d. Ex. 16: 4. Et pluere faciam vobis panem de coelo. Sic quoque Goël postremus descendere facit Man, q. d. Ps. 72: 16. Erit multitudo frumenti super terram.* Schöttgenii Horae Hebraeae et Talmudicae; Vol. I. p. 359.

In the last of the above quotations, that from Ps. 72: 16, the words of the original are: *יְהִי עֲשֹׂר־בָּר בְּאֶרֶץ צֶמַח הָהָרִים*, while the English version renders: *There shall be an handful of corn in the earth upon the top of the mountains.* But many take the word *עֲשֹׂר*, as did the Rabbi here quoted, in the sense of *abundance*. This gives the following: *There shall be an abundance of corn on the earth on the top of the mountains; which Rabbi Isaac interpreted of an abundance of manna covering the mountain-tops.*

³ The reference is to Ps. 78: 24, 25.

V. 32. Then Jesus said unto them: Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.

In this answer the Divine wisdom of our Lord shines forth with heavenly brightness. Instead of pausing to discuss with them the question of a renewal of the sign of manna, he calls off their thoughts at once from the material to the spiritual; and, at the same time, prepares the way for exhibiting himself as a true sign from heaven in the highest and noblest sense. — *Moses gave you not that bread from heaven.* The meaning is, that the manna which Moses gave to the Israelites came only from the material heavens, and was, like them, material in its nature. It was "the meat which perisheth," and therefore unable to give life to those who partook of it.¹ — *But my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven;* bread which comes from the true heaven, and is itself true bread. Thus he sets it in strong contrast with the manna in respect to both its source and its nature.

V. 33. For the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.

That which cometh down from heaven. That this is the true rendering, and not, as in our version: *He which cometh down from heaven*, is manifest from the following considerations: *First*, it agrees best with our Saviour's progressive method of unfolding the truth in this discourse. To have announced *himself* as the bread of life, at this stage of the discussion, would have been premature. *Secondly*, the annunciation in the thirty-fifth verse following: "*I am the bread of life*," plainly contains a new idea, and, as such, makes a new impression on the minds of the multitude. Their response to the declaration in the present verse was: "Lord, evermore give us this bread." But the moment that he announced himself as the bread of life, "they murmured at him." *Thirdly*, the present participle, ὁ καταβαίνων, cannot refer to the historic fact of Christ's descent from heaven. In this case the perfect καταβέβηκα, is used, or the aorist participle καταβὰς. It denotes rather the *inherent quality* of the bread as heavenly in its origin, for which the present tense is appropriate. "The varying use of the present, ὁ καταβαίνων ἐν τ. οὐρ. vs. 33, 50; and of the aorist, ὁ καταβὰς ἐν τ. οὐρ. vs. 41, 51 (compare vs. 38, 42, καταβέβηκα ἐν τ. οὐρ.), does not allow us to think here of

¹ V 49.

an enallage of tenses. But the ground why John uses, in the one case, the participle of the present, and, in the other, that of the aorist, is the following: vs. 33 and 50 contain only the general description of the true heavenly bread — what it is in contrast with the earthly manna, so that, in both instances, the present *ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τ. οὐρ.* is used only in an adjective sense.”¹

V. 34. Then said they unto him: Lord, evermore give us this bread.

To determine the exact meaning of these words is a work of difficulty. The opinion of several of the ancients, as Chrysostom and Augustine, and of Calvin among the moderns, that they were spoken ironically, must be decidedly rejected. According to Tholuck, they did not clearly apprehend what Christ had intended, but hoped, nevertheless, for something that was in its essence earthly; very much as the Samaritan woman met our Lord's offer of living water with the response: “Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw.”² But perhaps they understood our Lord's words in the preceding verse of a repetition of the miracle of manna in a higher form, and asked accordingly that he would evermore feed them with such bread.

V. 35. But Jesus said unto them: I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.

Our Lord now announces, for the first time in this discourse, the great central doctrine of the Gospel, that he is *himself* the life and sustenance of the soul. Towards this his words had been tending from the beginning. The order of development is this: Christ has the bread of life *to give*,³ this bread *descends from heaven*,⁴ this bread is *himself*. What follows is an expansion and particularization of the high truths contained in the present annunciation. We must carefully notice the solemn earnestness with which our Lord insists on the fact that salvation is not something out of himself, to which he can direct men, but a well-spring residing within himself and flowing out from himself to sinners. Prophets and apostles could instruct men where eternal life may be found, and to this work was their office limited; but Christ *gives* men eternal life of his own

¹ Lücke, Com. über Joh. in loco.

² John 4: 15.

³ V. 27.

⁴ V. 33.

proper power. He does not direct them elsewhere for help, but offers himself as an all-sufficient Helper.—*He that cometh to me, shall never hunger.* To come to Christ is to give ourselves up in unlimited faith, love and obedience to his control. Thus we feed on Christ, and find all our wants satisfied.—*He that believeth on me shall never thirst.* This is added to complete the idea of sustenance. In food and drink lies the full nourishment of the body. So Jesus is the food and drink of the believer's soul, and in him all its desires are satisfied.

V. 36. But I said unto you, that ye have both seen me, and believe not.

The Saviour understood well how offensive to the multitude would be this announcement of himself as "the bread of life;" and he anticipates their cavils by upbraiding them with their unbelief.—*Have both seen me;* that is, have seen my miracles.—*And believe not.* You refuse to receive the evidence which they give of my Divine mission. The question has been raised: *When* had Jesus said this? Not directly in the present discourse, but virtually in the twenty-sixth verse; for the words: "Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles," imply that, though they had seen his miracles, they had hardened their hearts against their proper influence, which was to produce faith in himself. If one is not satisfied with this explanation, then he must refer the words either to something omitted in the Evangelist's record, or (what is more probable) to former declarations made by Jesus to the people of Capernaum.

V. 37. All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out.

The neuter *nũ* is used here, as elsewhere by John, collectively for the masculine.¹—*All that the Father giveth me.* God gives men to the Son in his eternal purpose,² and also by his executive act in carrying out that purpose. The reference here is to the executive act, that of *drawing*³ and *teaching*,⁴ which will be considered hereafter. Having upbraided his hearers with their hardness of heart and unbelief in rejecting him, the Saviour adds a solemn admonition of their dependence on his Father's grace that they may receive him and be saved. Thus he seeks to humble their pride and bring them to serious con-

¹ V. 39. 17: 2. 1 John 5: 4.

² Eph. 1: 4, 5. 3: 11.

³ V. 44.

⁴ V. 45.

sideration and repentance. Then, from the fulness of his compassionate heart, he sets forth the greatness and certainty of the salvation which he offers to lost sinners.

Vs. 38—40. For I came down from heaven, not that I might do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father's will who hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day. For this is the will of him that sent me, that every one who seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.

Not to do mine own will. This accords with the uniform representation of the New Testament, that Christ acts not of himself, but in accordance with a commission received from the Father. He comes to do, not his own, but the Father's will, as has been fully shown in the first part of the present Article. What is the Father's will in sending him he proceeds to unfold. — *I should lose nothing.* He had just before declared, that all whom the Father had given him should come to him. He now adds that not one of them shall be lost. He will keep them all to the end, and raise them up at the last day. This agrees with another of his declarations: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any one pluck them out of my hand."¹ In both of these passages there is a tacit claim to the possession of "all power in heaven and in earth,"² for unless he were able to overcome all opposition in heaven and in earth, he could not thus guarantee the final salvation of every one whom the Father has given him. — *Seeth the Son and believeth on him.* These words are opposed to those which he had already used of the multitude: "Ye have both seen me, and believe not."³ To see the Son, is to have an inward discovery, through the Father's drawing and teaching, of his Divine glory and excellence. Such a view of Christ is always connected with faith in him. — *May have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.* These two expressions contain the whole idea of salvation. *First*, they who believe on Christ, *have* everlasting life as a present spiritual possession. Through their union with Christ, which implies the incipient restoration of their souls to God's moral image, eternal life is already begun within them, and shall be perpetuated and per-

¹ John 10: 27, 28.² Matt. 28: 18.³ V. 36.

fectured in eternity. In this sense Christ repeatedly declares that they who believe in himself, shall never die. "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die."¹ "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."² *Secondly*, they who believe in Christ shall be *raised up* by him at the last day. The restoration of the life of the body, in a glorious and perfect form, is the crowning act of Christ. Thus he abolishes death spiritual and corporeal, and presents his ransomed ones before his Father's throne "holy and without blemish" in both soul and body.

Vs. 41, 42. The Jews, therefore, murmured at him, because he said: I am the bread which came down from heaven. And they said: Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how is it then that he saith: I came down from heaven?

Our Saviour's gracious words found no response in the hearts of his hearers. They could see only the lowliness of his outward condition. It did not accord with their ideas of the Messiah that he should be of humble parentage, like themselves. How the son of Joseph and Mary, whom they had so long known as their neighbors, should claim a heavenly origin they could not comprehend; and they would not receive his testimony.

Vs. 43—45. Jesus, therefore, answered and said unto them: Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come to me, except the Father who hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets: And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore, that hath heard, and, hath learned of the Father cometh unto me.

Jesus did not pause to answer the question raised by the multitude: "How is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven?" The mystery of "God manifest in the flesh" is to be received, not upon philosophic explanation, but upon Divine testimony; and such was the testimony of Jesus, for God had doubly sealed it; by his own voice from heaven, and by the miracles which he commissioned him to perform in his name. Instead of wasting time in the discussion of this point, the Saviour warns them against a murmuring spirit, and, in connection with this, reminds them of their dependence upon his Father's help for ability to believe on himself. The *drawing* of the Father is the same as

¹ V. 50.² John 11: 26.

his teaching; for the passage from Isaiah: *And they shall be all taught of God*,¹ is plainly cited as an example of this drawing. The natural condition of all men is briefly but most forcibly described by the Apostle Paul: "Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the hardness of their hearts."² They are ignorant alike of God and of themselves, and do not understand their need of a spiritual salvation, such as Christ offers. Hence he must be to them "as a root out of dry ground," in whom they can discern "no beauty that" they "should desire him." And as this is a *willing* ignorance, having its ground in "the carnal mind" which is "enmity against God," they will never, self-moved, recover themselves from it; but will cherish it, and perish in it. To say this, which is but to repeat what the Scriptures declare on almost every page, is to affirm two things: *first*, that men's alienation from God and ignorance of him constitute, in the fullest sense of the words, *a voluntary state*, for which God justly holds them responsible;³ *secondly*, that it constitutes *a fatal hindrance* to their salvation; so that, if God do not interpose to bring them back to himself, they must perish. The Father draws men to Christ by teaching them both their need of spiritual salvation, and the glorious excellency and sufficiency of the Redeemer whom he has provided for them; and also by giving them grace to yield themselves up in hearty obedience to his authority, and make him the centre of their confidence and love; or, in Scriptural language, he "shines in their hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ;"⁴ and "works in them to will and to do of his good pleasure."⁵ Thus they, with the inward ear, hear and learn of the Father, and come to the Son for eternal life.⁶

In these words of our Saviour we have an instructive example of the true method of dealing with caviling unbelievers. This is, not to be always reasoning the case with them, and dwelling

¹ Isaiah 54: 13.

² Eph. 4: 18.

³ The carnal mind (*τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός*) is the free preference of the world to God; and, therefore, every state of mind that arises from it is also free.

⁴ 2 Cor. 4: 6.

⁵ Phil. 2: 13.

⁶ *Trahi eos dicit, quorum mentes illuminat Deus, et corda flectit ac format in Christi obedientiam.* Calvin in loco. This gives the two parts of which the Divine drawing consists; the *illumination of the mind* — "*mentes illuminat*," and the *influencing of the will* — "*corda flectit ac format*."

upon their ability and obligation as free agents; but also to exhibit, in full measure, their dependence upon Divine grace, and urge upon them the duty of a childlike and believing spirit. Human ability and responsibility constitute an important part of the truth, and should, therefore, be preached clearly and boldly; but human perverseness and dependence upon God is an equally important part, and should be preached with equal clearness and boldness. And this latter portion of the truth is peculiarly adapted to humble that proud and self-sufficient spirit which is the true root of caviling and unbelief. When exhibited in a Scriptural form its tendency is, not to quiet men in procrastination and inaction, but rather to impel them to "work out" their "own salvation with fear and trembling," under the awful conviction that, if they provoke God to withdraw from them his grace, they are undone forever. If any one hesitates to make a full exhibition of the Scriptural doctrine of men's dependence on God for moral power to receive Christ, through fear of its being perverted, let him remember that the doctrine of human ability has also, in a countless multitude of cases, been perverted to presumptuous self-confidence, and the consequent fatal neglect of repentance and faith. It is the preacher's duty and wisdom to exhibit all parts of Divine truth in due proportion, and put men upon their responsibility to God for the right use of it.

V. 46. Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he who is of God; he hath seen the Father.

These words, in their outward form, seem intended to guard against a misapprehension of the declaration just preceding: "Every man, therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me;" as if it had referred to an immediate and full vision of God. But while they do this, they also set in strong contrast our Saviour's knowledge of the Father and that of all mere men. All who are taught of God see him indirectly by an inward spiritual vision. To some, as to the ancient prophets, he has made a direct revelation of himself, but only in a certain measure, such as the present wants of his church demanded. But the Son has "seen the Father," in a full and absolute sense. He dwelt from eternity in his bosom, and his knowledge of him is perfect, in both manner and measure. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only

begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."¹

Vs. 47—51. Verily, verily, I say unto you: he that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that one may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

Jesus now enlarges upon his previous declaration: "I am the bread of life," and contrasts it with the manna which the Israelites ate in the wilderness. That was "the food which perisheth," and they who partook of it died; but he is the living bread from heaven, of which whosoever eats shall live forever. In what sense this is spoken, has been already shown.²— *This is the bread which cometh down from heaven.* The meaning is: This, and not the manna which your fathers ate. The interpretation of *ovros* in the sense of *such, of such efficacy*,³ is unnatural. — *I am the living bread.* Jesus calls himself the living bread, because he has life in himself, and therefore gives life to all who feed upon him.

Thus far our Lord carries out the simple figure of "the bread of life." But he now adds: *And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.* There can be no reasonable doubt that these words refer to his expiatory death on the cross, and thus contain an allusion to the *way* in which he is to become, to all who believe on him, the bread of life. For, *First*, this is their most natural (rather, we might say, their only natural) reference. *Secondly*, it is altogether in accordance with our Lord's manner, in addressing the multitude, that he should thus allude beforehand to his death. "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he."⁴ "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me."⁵ "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."⁶ "I lay down my life for the sheep."⁷ *Thirdly*, these words are the introduction to the address that follows on eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood, which, as will presently be shown, must refer to his flesh and blood as made an offering for sin.

¹ John 1: 18.

² Notes on v. 40.

³ So De Wette: "*Solches (von solcher Kraft) ist das — Brod, dass.*"

⁴ John 8: 28.

⁵ John 12: 32.

⁶ John 12: 24.

⁷ John 10: 15.

V. 52. The Jews, therefore, strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat?

Taking his words in a gross outward sense, it was natural that they should ask this question. But Jesus, instead of pausing to answer it, proceeded at once to reiterate and enlarge upon the declaration at which they took offence.

Vs. 53—58. Then Jesus said unto them: Verily, verily, I say unto you. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is the bread that came down from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth this bread shall live forever.

The exact interpretation of these words has been a matter of much controversy. We may mention, as one extreme, the opinion that our Lord is only reasserting here what he has already said in the declaration: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven." Those who maintain this view of the passage understand by Christ's flesh and blood simply his earthly manifestation in a human form, taking the expressions, *flesh and blood*, for the totality of his earthly personality. So among the ancients Basil, as quoted by Tholuck: ἡ σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, πᾶσα αὐτοῦ ἡ μυστικὴ ἐπιδημία, "the body and blood of Christ are his whole mystical sojourn among men." The same interpretation has been adopted by several of the moderns. But Tholuck well remarks, on the fifty-first verse, that, "if Christ wished by these words to express only the very same idea which he had before uttered, one cannot understand why he should have changed the perfectly clear expression, ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ζῶν, into the obscure ἐγὼ δώσω ὑμῖν τὴν σάρκα μου;" and the same principle applies to the whole of the present passage, as compared with vs. 48—50. But further than this, the repeated mention of Christ's flesh and blood, in connection with the declaration already considered, that he will give his flesh for the life of the world, naturally leads our thoughts to his bloody death on the cross, when his blood was "shed for many for the remission of sins."¹

¹ When the words *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* are used in the New Testament, as a general expression for humanity, they always contain the accessory idea of weakness, VOL. XL No. 44.

The opposite extreme is that of those who refer these words directly to the eucharist by way of anticipation.¹ This has been maintained by many from ancient times, and is especially advocated by the interpreters of the papal church, since here they find a principal support for their dogma of transubstantiation. But when we take the true view of the Lord's Supper, that its elements are *symbols* of Christ's atoning sacrifice, it must appear highly improbable that in these solemn asseverations our Lord should have referred to *symbols* of an institution yet to be established, and not to the *truth itself* which that institution symbolically sets forth. Rather was it the great central truth of Christianity, his propitiatory sacrifice for the salvation of the world, which gave rise to the symbols of the eucharist, that our Lord here anticipated, than the eucharist itself.

And here we see the true relation of the present words to the eucharist. They are not a reference to that institution, but to the great fact of Christianity which it sets forth in a symbolical way. The eucharist and this address in the synagogue at Capernaum both have for their foundation the same view of Christ in his relation to believers. That which makes the figurative language of the discourse so pertinent and forcible, gives also to the symbols of the Lord's Supper their pertinence and force. They both set forth *Christ crucified as the food and drink of the soul*. And, in respect to the manner of representation, the agreement between the symbols of the eucharist and the words now under consideration, is remarkable. In both, Christ's body is exhibited as the food, and his blood as the drink of his disciples. It is, indeed, true that, in the institution of the eucharist, Jesus employed the word *σῶμα*, *body*, not *σὰρξ*, *flesh*. But, since he

physical or moral. Matt. 16: 17. John 1: 13. 1 Cor. 15: 50. Gal. 1: 16. Eph. 6: 12. Heb. 2: 14. In this latter passage it is expressly affirmed that Christ became a partaker of flesh and blood, that he might be made subject to death, this being the way in which he was to destroy him that had the power of death. So far, then, as the argument from the union of these words goes, it shows that they denote, not so much the simple manifestation of Christ in human nature, as his subjection to death. But we doubt the correctness of the parallelism.

¹ The reader may see in the third part of Dr. Turner's "Essay on our Lord's Discourse at Capernaum," a good summary of the views entertained by the early fathers, and by some modern divines, on this point. To this treatise we are indebted for valuable suggestions, although the learned author's aim is different from ours. He is combatting the great error of Romanism — that of transubstantiation — rather than a low humanitarian view of Christ's person and office.

made a distinction between this and his *blood*, the meaning of *σῶμα* must, in this case, come to that of *σάρξ*. We are not, however, to inquire for the significancy of Christ's body given for the life of the world, apart from that of his blood shed for the remission of sin. The two constitute one inseparable whole. In giving his body, he gave also his blood; and in giving his blood, his body. His body procures life for the world through the remission of sin; his blood procures the remission of sin that leads to eternal life. Each symbol, then, of the eucharist represents the whole of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice; although, in accordance with the Divine declaration: "Without shedding of blood is no remission,"¹ that of the wine brings most distinctly to view the idea of expiation; for the blood, which this represents, is the life of the body,² and expiation lies in the giving of life. Accordingly, it was not to his body, but to his blood, that our Saviour ascribed the power of expiation. The eucharist reaches the inner spiritual man through a representation made to the outward senses; and its twofold exhibition of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice under the two emblems of bread and wine, gives vividness and completeness to the impression. Precisely the same effect is produced in the passage now under consideration, by our Lord's twofold specification of his flesh and his blood. Each of them contains in itself the idea of his expiatory sacrifice; but the separate mention of the two adds distinctness and force. That Jesus does not mean to ascribe to the eating of his flesh a significance separate from that of drinking his blood, is manifest from the general course of representation. He begins by mentioning his flesh alone;³ then he specifies his flesh as "meat indeed," and his blood as "drink indeed;"⁴ and, finally, includes all in eating *himself*,⁵ with this returning to the representation with which he had begun: "This is that bread which came down from heaven."⁶

To these general remarks, we add a notice of some particular clauses in the passage. In the fifty-fourth verse, the Saviour ascribes to eating his flesh and drinking his blood precisely the same efficacy which he had already done in the fortieth verse to seeing the Son, and believing on him; he *hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day*. From this his hearers might

¹ Heb. 9: 22.² Lev. 17: 11.³ V. 51.⁴ Vs. 53—56.⁵ V. 57.⁶ V. 58.

have reasonably inferred that he employed these remarkable words in a spiritual, and not in a gross outward sense; although they would have still contained a mystery which nothing but his death and resurrection for the salvation of men could solve. So in the fifty-sixth verse, he represents the effect of eating his flesh and drinking his blood to be a mutual union between himself and his disciples, he *dwelleth in me, and I in him*; which again points to a spiritual meaning. Then, in the following verse, he compares the living union which exists between himself and those who eat him, to that which exists between himself and the Father. — *As the living Father hath sent me.* The Father is called *living*, because he has life in himself, and is the source of all life. Why the words: *hath sent me*? Doubtless to show that he is acting in accordance with the Father's will, which is essential to the idea that follows. — *And I live by the Father.* Of these words the best explanation is found in another declaration of the Saviour: "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself."¹ As Jesus is the ground of life to those who eat him, so the Father is to him the ground of life. He lives, not separately from the Father, but by virtue of his union with him. Thus all is made to depend upon the Father, "that God may be all in all."² This is an idea upon which Jesus elsewhere dwells with solemn earnestness and pathos. "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me."³ The same idea of oneness and subordination to the Father, as the supreme Head of all things, is thus expressed by the Apostle Paul: "All are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's."⁴

V. 59. These things said he in the synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum.

These words indicate the close of our Lord's discourse in the synagogue. What follows seems to have been spoken elsewhere, perhaps, as De Wette suggests, on the way from the

¹ John 5: 26.

² 1 Cor. 15: 28.

³ John 17: 21—23.

⁴ 1 Cor. 3: 22, 23.

synagogue home; yet, in immediate connection with the foregoing, and to a part, at least, of the same auditory.

V. 60. Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard this, said: This is an hard saying; who can hear it?

This is an hard saying. They refer to what Jesus had said of the efficacy of eating his flesh and drinking his blood. The saying was "*hard*," not so much in the sense of *unintelligible*, as of *distasteful*, offensive.

Vs. 61—63. When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them: Doth this offend you? If then ye shall see the Son of man ascending up where he was before? The spirit is that which quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.

The meaning of these words has been a matter of much discussion, and, in the interpretation of them, commentators have differed greatly. Without attempting to enumerate all their various opinions, we shall content ourselves with proposing that view which seems to us most accordant with the context. The words: *Doth this offend you?* we refer to the whole tenor of the preceding discourse. In this our Lord had represented himself as "the living bread which came down from heaven," and had declared that, "if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever;" and, what seemed a still harsher assertion, he had affirmed of his flesh and blood: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." Not only was the idea itself of feeding on his flesh and blood offensive to them, but his high claim to be the living bread which came down from heaven, and which had power to give eternal life to all that should partake of it, gave still higher offence to them. That the son of Joseph and Mary should not only claim for himself a heavenly origin, but also the power to bestow upon men eternal life, and the resurrection of the just, was what they could not endure to hear. In view of this Jesus asks: *If then ye shall see the Son of man ascending up where he was before?* as much as to say: If what I have now claimed for myself offends you, what will you say when you see me ascending up to my original abode in heaven,¹ and invested with all

¹ De Wette denies any reference here to our Lord's *bodily visible* ascent to heaven, on two grounds: *first*, that John says nothing concerning this; *secondly*,

power in heaven and in earth? Instead of receding from his lofty position because of the offence which it gave to his hearers, he advances to a still higher eminence. This is altogether in accordance with his general manner in dealing with cavillers and opponents. The very points at which they take exception, he presses the more earnestly and asserts in still stronger terms, because they are points of vital importance, upon which depends the true apprehension of his character and office.— *The spirit is that which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.* In these words our Lord guards his hearers against the error of understanding what he had said concerning himself, as the bread of life, and concerning his flesh and blood, as the food and drink of his disciples, in a gross material way; as if he had said: I have spoken of myself as the living bread which came down from heaven, and of my flesh and blood as the food and drink of men, but think not that you are to feed upon me in a literal and outward way. “The spirit is that which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.” “The spirit” here is not the spirit of Christ in opposition to his flesh, nor his Divine, in opposition to his human, nature; for it is upon “*the Word made flesh*” that believers feed; but, “the spirit” and “the flesh” are here taken in their generic sense, the former denoting that which is spiritual, and the latter, that which is material. Jesus means that it is the spiritual, not the material, feeding upon himself that gives life.—*The words which I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.* These words of Jesus contained the true doctrine concerning his person and office. The loving and believing apprehension of them constituted, therefore, the very act of feeding upon him in a spiritual way. Thus they became, to all who truly received them, spirit and life.

that, as Christ's flesh had not descended from heaven, so we cannot conceive of it as ascending up where Christ was before (John 1: 1. 16: 28. 17: 5). But neither of these arguments has any true force. As to the first, it is sufficient to say, that John's omission to notice in a *historic way* (for he does notice it, as here, incidentally) the fact of our Lord's bodily visible ascent to heaven, is to be explained rather from its *universal recognition* as a cardinal truth of Christianity, which made the explicit mention of it unnecessary, than from his ignorance or denial of it. Who, indeed, in his senses, can suppose that the beloved disciple omitted from his Christianity the fact of Jesus's ascent in a bodily form to heaven, which was as universally received by the primitive church as that of his resurrection?

As to the second, it is enough to observe that it was *in the flesh*, and, therefore, in a *bodily visible form*, that the eternal Word ascended up where he was before.

Vs. 64, 65. But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him. And he said: Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me except it be given unto him of my Father.

Jesus again reiterates what he had already said concerning an unbelieving spirit, and concerning the necessity of Divine grace to a true apprehension and reception of himself. — *But there are some of you that believe not*; as if he had said: I know that my words will be of no avail to some of you, for you are under the control of an unbelieving spirit — *Except it be given unto him of my Father*; the same as, except my Father draw him;¹ except he hear and learn of my Father.²

In bringing the present Article to a close, it may be well to dwell for a few moments upon the question so much agitated by some of the commentators: Why did our Lord exercise so much reserve in explaining the highly figurative language of this discourse? To the multitudes in the synagogue he seems to have offered not a word of explanation. On the contrary, when they took offence at his language, he only reasserted it in stronger terms. It was not till after the close of the address that he gave to his attendants the brief solution: "The spirit is that which quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." And we find, upon examination, that this accords with his usual mode of dealing with the people. So to the ignorant Samaritan woman he said: "Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again. But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life;"³ and left her to ponder in her heart the deep meaning of the words. Very similar language he addressed to the multitudes assembled at the feast of tabernacles.⁴ It was not to the multitude, but to his disciples, that he explained the parables of the sower, and of the tares in the field.⁵ His general rule is thus stated by Mark: "And with many such parables spake he the word unto them, as they were able to hear it. But without a parable spake he not unto them: and when they were alone, he expounded all things to his disciples."⁶

¹ V. 44.² V. 45.³ John 4: 13, 14.⁴ John 7: 37—39.⁵ Matt. 13: 13, 36.⁶ Mark 4: 33, 34.

At first thought it might seem best that the figure and the explanatory key should go together. But a little reflection may perhaps convince us that this view is more plausible than profound. Why did Jesus address the multitudes in parables, and not by the plain statement of spiritual truths? It was not certainly because he wished them to remain in ignorance and perish. To many of them this was, indeed, the result, the foreseen result. But it was not the proper end which he proposed to himself in adopting the parabolic method of instruction. That end is sufficiently indicated in the words just quoted: "*As they were able to hear it.*" Their dulness of apprehension is assigned by Jesus himself as the reason why he spake to them in parables.¹ They were not prepared to receive instruction in a more direct form. There was a "needs be," lying not in Jesus's loving and compassionate heart, but in their low and carnal views, why he should veil "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven" beneath the drapery of parables; although to many with the sad issue (represented by the Saviour as the just penalty of their unteachableness), "that seeing they might see, and not perceive; and hearing they might hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them." Now if we admit the validity of the above reason, assigned by our Lord, why "without a parable spake he not unto them,"² it would seem to be both unreasonable and illogical to demand that he should immediately subjoin an explanation in plain terms. With the disciples, who had already the foundation of a spiritual character, and had made some progress in the apprehension of spiritual truths, this method might be employed, but not with the multitude. In their bosoms the seeds of spiritual truths were to be sown, and they could not receive them, except they were, so to speak, encased in a shell of material images. And the images selected by our Lord have a singular pertinency, as well as a wonderful depth and fulness of meaning. They are, indeed, baskets of silver net-work containing apples of gold. The apparent harshness of some of them, as that of eating Christ, of feeding on his flesh and drinking his blood, constitutes their excellency; for in this lies their strength. No figure less forcible could have been a suitable vehicle for the idea of that inward union with Christ by which

¹ Matt. 13: 13—15. Mark 4: 11, 12. Luke 8: 10.

² Matt. 13: 34.

he becomes the life and nourishment of the soul. It was our Lord's intention that the people should ponder the meaning of these images, and have "great reasoning among themselves" concerning them. Thus all who were of an earnest and teachable spirit, would gradually come to the apprehension of the high truths which they covered, and only the careless and light-minded remain ignorant of their spiritual significance. The premature attempt to unfold their meaning in plain language to the multitude (aside from the fact that some of them pointed to events yet future, and could, therefore, have only a historic interpretation), would have had no other result than that of destroying the shell without feeding the soul with the kernel which it covered. The Divine wisdom of Jesus left to the people themselves the work of enucleating the kernel from the shell, and finding that it was, in very deed, spirit and not flesh. His example in this particular deserves the serious consideration of all religious teachers. In dealing with the ignorant they should be careful lest their laborious explanations, designed to bring everything spiritual within the apprehension of the finite human understanding, prove to be an *eliminating* rather than an *illuminating* process.

ARTICLE III.

ANSELM'S DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION AND ATONEMENT.

A TRANSLATION OF THE "CUR DEUS HOMO."

By James Gardiner Vose, Milton, Mass.

[In presenting a translation of this work, it may be proper to give a brief account of the career of its author, and of the manner in which he developed the monastic life and discipline.

Paul of Thebes and Anthony of Alexandria have each been called the father of monasticism. Yet neither the one in his lonely grotto, nor the other in the devout community gathered around him, could have foreseen the system which here had its

faint beginnings. Doubtless at this earlier period of monasticism, there was much in it that was irrational. The influence of eastern superstitions, habits of life and feeling, was doubtless far greater than we can easily trace. Yet there was also a basis for monachism in true Christianity. The corruptions of the church, so painfully manifest, called for a new consecration among its more devout members, which should divide them as naturally from formal religionists, as before they had been separated from the world. Monasticism was instituted to supply this profound want. It was, as it has been truly called: "The Church within the Church." From the first monks to Anselm of Canterbury, seven centuries had intervened, in which the system had been fully matured. The evils springing from its own weakness, and the still greater evils attaching themselves to it as a convenient instrument from without, had been abundantly revealed. They had been felt within the cloister, and already had Odo and Berno, with many more, equals in zeal if not in intellect, assayed the work of reformation. There was a return, as it were, to the spirit of the earlier ages, and if, among many of the older monks, the abuses of the system still remained, many more now sought its sacred order for the better hopes of holiness that it held out. "The Hildebrandian epoch of reform," says Neander, "was accompanied with the outpouring of a spirit of compunction and repentance on the western nations. It was the same spirit which, in different directions, promoted the crusades, monasticism and the spread of sects, which contended against the hierarchy."¹ Of all, who at that period sought the conventual life, none did it with simpler views than Anselm. Trained under the guidance of a mother, who plied him with every loving and pious motive, and wrought upon by that celestial influence, which alone is more powerful than this, it was not strange that he should early imbibe that devout enthusiasm which led him irresistibly to the monastic order. The dreams of his childhood foreshadow the course of his history. In visions he toiled up the steep ascent of the neighboring Alps to gain audience with God, and there beheld and feasted with the King of heaven — emblem of the effort and the victory of his whole life. Driven by paternal harshness from his youthful home, he wandered far in search of a congenial resting-place, till accident brought him to the convent of Bec; where, taking gladly the

¹ Torrey's Neander, Vol. III. p. 233.

solemn obligations of his order, he threw himself into the privacy of prayer and contemplation, doubtless hoping from such seclusion never to be withdrawn. And, though allowed for only three years to remain a simple monk, yet three and thirty years do we find him dwelling in that loved monastery, and devoting his highest energies to the cultivation of inward piety. Self-edification was the great primary idea in monasticism, and it absorbed the whole soul of Anselm. "Seek not so much," he would say, "a place of usefulness to others, as one in which you may be edified yourself." With such a rule, he gave the earlier years of his monastic life to prayer and devout study. Though imposing upon himself no useless penance, yet his conquest over bodily wants was truly remarkable. There seemed no need of mortifying the flesh, for the spirit had reached such a height as no longer to notice its encumbrance. Devoting his days to study, his nights were often spent in the vigils of prayer; or, upon his couch, sleep gave place to holy ecstasies, or profound meditation upon God. The monks, who opened the chapel for matins, not seldom found him there upon his knees, where the night had sped rapidly away in the fervor of his prolonged devotion. He fasted to an extent almost incredible, yet not in periods of long abstinence, as if for a show of piety, but in the uniform course of daily life. Nor let us think for a moment that in the rigor of monastic discipline he lost the glow of religious fervor. No studies, no routine of heavy duties, ever quenched the ardor of his early longing for the more inspiring views of God made manifest. From his lone cell, we hear the breathing of his ardent love for Christ, hallowing the stillness of the night, while he utters his glowing adoration: "What can be more delightful than to see the man, who is the creator of man! What more touching, than to behold in this Mediator between God and man, the Lord Jesus Christ, eternity as it were begin! loftiness become lowliness! He is conceived in a mother's womb, who sits evermore in the Father's bosom; born in time from a mother without father, who was begotten in eternity by a Father without mother. Folded in swaddling clothes lies he, who has decked the firmament with stars and the earth with flowers. A manger holds him whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain. He grows in wisdom, whose wisdom is without beginning and end; in age, whose years do not increase and do not diminish; in grace, who is the author of all grace. He is subject to

parents, before whom all creatures bow. He who is the bread, is an hungered. He who is the fountain, is thirsty. He who is the way, becomes weary. The Glory suffers itself to be put to shame; the Majesty to be humiliated; the Life to be slain."

The pious contemplations of Anselm were closely connected with his profoundest studies. His intellectual mould was that of the true monk. Study was his delight, and speculative study the most of all. Weariness and vacancy never tinged his solitude, and the public cares of later life only whetted his desire for the musing of the cell. Subjects the most vast and sublime, were his familiar food. The being and nature of God, he studied with remarkable intensity. And God revealed in flesh, stirring on one side the very ocean-depths of speculation, and on the other, touching the spirit's harp in the tenderest of human interests, was a subject which filled the mind of Anselm with the highest wonder and joy. To this he turned with childlike affection amid all the cares and dignity of official life. Follow him an exile from his country, where royal oppression had almost crushed the hopes of piety; and, while king and pope, prelates and nobles were agitating his claims, behold him in his lone dwelling in the German forests, returning with all the freshness of his early consecration, to the life of the recluse. There, as if there were no interest but the purifying of his own soul, and no pleasure but that of holy contemplation, he bends in profound thought over his immortal work, the "*Cur Deus Homo*." From such seclusion, had Anselm been less thoroughly imbued with the spirit of real Christianity, perhaps he might never have withdrawn. But the piety which made him a monk, was too deep and pure to leave him an anchorite. His own noble sentiment, that "a man's goodness belongs to and is an advantage to all holy beings," so modified his views of self-edification, that he could find no escape from the offices of public teacher, counselor and guide. Accordingly, when called at an early age to the head of the convent, no reluctance could overcome the claims of Christian duty. How reads the history of his thirty years at Bec? He sits in the chair of abbot, guiding her temporal affairs with care and patience; giving judgment upon all church questions, whether of faith or practice; and freely laying aside his own employments to counsel and comfort his brethren. And what says the history of his later days? Ask of the hundreds and thousands who crowded about him when an exile on his

way to Rome. The cloistered monk had now become the itinerant missionary. He spends whole days in preaching, and administering the sacred rite of confirmation; days, as he himself expresses it, of most delightful feeling, in which was breathed no morbid sigh for solitude. Still later than this, we find Anselm in the height of his episcopal prosperity, at the dissolute court of Henry, aiming his shafts at every form of sin, and making the nobles tremble, and renounce their crimes. Behold him now the court preacher, led by duty to fields the furthest possible removed from the seclusion of his early choice. Retaining all his love of holy solitude, he was yet active in the most discordant scenes. All else that characterizes the monk, seemed lost in the course of his labors, except that piety which made him take the vow, and which constituted its only value. He was sixty years old when made archbishop of Canterbury, though urging every objection to an office, which was fairly thrust upon him by king and prelates. Yet witness the uncompromising fidelity with which he discharged its duties. He who was only forced to receive the crosier, cannot now be forced to abate one tittle of its dignity. He who learned so thoroughly and urged so warmly the monastic rule of obedience, shows now, in his position of authority, that he is well able to govern. We may not follow his long contests against royal oppression. In every one, with mildness, yet with unconquerable firmness, he sustains the rights of the church. Single-handed, he contends successfully against king and prelates, and even his own clergy; trying every art both to defend the honor of the church, and to cure the hideous wounds of priestly corruption. So heavy labors the human spirit could not long endure. Wasted with lingering sickness, though bearing the duties of his office to his latest days, he comes at length to the grave. His death-scene was a just expression of his life's history. He had one wish to live. It was that he might bring into clearer light an abstruse subject of Christian speculation, which pressed upon his mind. With his last effort of physical strength, he stretched out his hands in holy benediction upon the king, the clergy and the people, then dropped his head upon his breast in prayer. Never, from a monastic life, has been developed so perfect a character. The monk had grown into the apostle. Bearing from the cloister all its piety and discipline and industry, he infused new life into the church, and into his own character, by his manifold labors.

Prayer must sometimes give place to study; study to instruction; instruction to hospitality; and all of these to his more arduous official duties; so that each in turn made purer all the rest, and in their varied round, symmetry was given to the whole man. In piety, he was the revered example of the church; in knowledge, the expounder of her faith; in guidance, her wisest counsellor; and, in office, her valiant defender, her zealous reformer.

The circumstances under which the "*Cur Deus Homo*" was written, are interesting to notice. The difficulties of Anselm with the king, arising at his very consecration as archbishop, became in a short time so harassing, that he judged it necessary to lay his matters personally before the pope. And, though this were voluntary on his part, yet it was really an exile, for the king had no thought that he would ever return. In the midst, however, of all his public cares, he found time for study; and, at the earnest entreaty of others, as he tells us, though doubtless also at the instance of his own feelings, he began this work, even while discharging the earlier duties of his life at Canterbury. Nor did even his banishment interpose any serious interruption to the progress of this treatise. While at Rome, in the ensuing season, awaiting the mandates of the church, the heat became so extreme, that he determined to travel northward. Accordingly, he found a retreat in the German town of Telesi, but was afterwards induced to remove to Sclavia, a rural estate not far distant. He was entertained there by John, a monk formerly associated with him at Bec. "Here," said Anselm, "will I take breath;" which was but to say: "Here will I forget the world, and return to Divine contemplations." In this retirement he soon finished the "*Cur Deus Homo*," which is written, it will be perceived, in the form of a dialogue, thus giving a beautiful instance of the manner in which his healthful piety linked his solitary studies to the improvement of others. The person selected was no fictitious character, but a much-loved pupil, whose youth was happily fostered under the care of Anselm, and who became his successor at Bec, in the year 1124.

Of the work itself, it may be said, that it forms the most important epoch in the history of the doctrine of atonement. The views held for ten centuries, regarded the death of Christ as a sacrifice, to which was added also the idea of a conquest over the devil. By the victory of Christ, man was, as it were,

released from the power of the devil, to whom he rightfully belonged. Though traces of a more correct understanding of the doctrine may be formed at an earlier period, yet it was left for Anselm to bring out with clear and thorough reasoning the view, afterwards adopted by all branches of the orthodox church. To him belongs the praise of making the first distinct, formal exhibition of the atonement, as a satisfaction required by the justice of God. Says Baur: "The relation in which Anselm's theory of satisfaction stands to the notions which had generally obtained previous to his time, is chiefly expressed by his decided opposition to the principle on which those notions were founded in respect to the devil."¹ We cannot, therefore, well overrate the historic value of this treatise; nor will a careful study of it lessen our view of the merits of the work, though its scholastic nicety be sometimes distasteful. In addition to the common sources of information, it may be well to notice the somewhat recent work entitled: "*Anselm von Canterbury*," by Hasse. It is published in two volumes; the first is biographical, giving a full and interesting picture of his eventful life; the second presents the growth and character of his doctrinal system. With distinctness and simplicity, both the man and his works are set before the reader.—Tr.]

ANSELM'S PREFACE.

This work was undertaken for the sake of certain persons, who, without my knowledge, were engaged in transcribing the earlier parts of it, before it had been completed and revised. I have, therefore, been obliged to finish it, as best I could, more hurriedly than was convenient for me, and so within narrower limits than I could wish. For, had an undisturbed and adequate period been allowed me for publishing it, I should have introduced and subjoined many things, about which I have been silent. For it was while suffering under great anguish of heart (the origin and reason of which are known to God), that, at the entreaty of others, I began the book in England, and finished it when an exile in Capua. From the theme, on which it was published, I have called it: *Cur Deus Homo*; and have divided it into two short books. The first contains the objec-

¹ Baur, *Versöhnungslehre*, p. 155; quoted in *Hagenbach's History of Doctrines*, Vol. II. p. 34.

tions of infidels, who despise the Christian faith, because they deem it contrary to reason; and also the replies of believers; and, in fine, leaving Christ out of view (as if nothing had ever been known of him), it proves, by absolute reasons, the impossibility that any man should be saved without him. Again, in the second book, likewise, as if nothing were known of Christ, it is moreover shown by plain reasoning and fact, that human nature was ordained for this purpose, viz. that every man should enjoy a happy immortality, both in body and in soul; and that it was necessary, that this design for which man was made should be fulfilled; but that it could not be fulfilled, unless God became man, and unless all things were to take place, which we hold with regard to Christ. I request all, who may wish to copy this book, to prefix this brief preface, with the heads of the whole work, at its commencement; so that, into whosoever hands it may fall, as he looks on the face of it, there may be nothing in the whole body of the work, which shall escape his notice.

BOOK FIRST.

CHAP. I. *The question on which the whole work rests.*

I have been often and most earnestly requested by many, both personally and by letter, that I would hand down, in writing, the proofs of a certain doctrine of our faith, which I am accustomed to give to inquirers; for they say that these proofs gratify them, and are considered sufficient. This they ask, not for the sake of attaining to faith by means of reason, but that they may be gladdened by understanding and meditating on those things which they believe; and that, as far as possible, they may be always ready to convince any one, who demands of them a reason of that hope which is in us. And this question, both infidels are accustomed to bring up against us, ridiculing Christian simplicity as absurd; and many believers ponder it in their hearts; for what cause or necessity, in sooth, God became man, and by his own death, as we believe and affirm, restored life to the world; when he might have done this, by means of some other being, angelic or human, or merely by his will. Not only the learned, but also many unlearned persons, interest themselves in this inquiry, and seek for its solution. Therefore, since many desire to consider this subject, and, though

it seem very difficult in the investigation, it is yet plain to all in the solution, and attractive for the value and beauty of the reasoning; although what ought to be sufficient has been said by the holy fathers and their successors, yet I will take pains to disclose to inquirers what God has seen fit to lay open to me. And since investigations which are carried on by question and answer, are thus made more plain to many, and especially to less quick minds, and on that account are more gratifying, I will take to argue with me one of those persons who agitate this subject; one, who among the rest impels me more earnestly to it, so that in this way Boso may question and Anselm reply.

CHAP. II. *How those things which are to be said should be received.*

Boso. As the right order requires us to believe the deep things of Christian faith, before we undertake to discuss them by reason; so to my mind it appears a neglect, if, after we are established in the faith, we do not seek to understand what we believe. Therefore, since I thus consider myself to hold the faith of our redemption, by the prevenient grace of God, so that, even were I unable in any way to understand what I believe, still nothing could shake my constancy; I desire that you should discover to me, what, as you know, many besides myself ask, for what necessity and cause God, who is omnipotent, should have assumed the littleness and weakness of human nature for the sake of its renewal? *Anselm.* You ask of me a thing which is above me, and therefore I tremble to take in hand subjects too lofty for me, lest, when some one may have thought or even seen that I do not satisfy him, he will rather believe that I am in error with regard to the substance of the truth, than that my intellect is not able to grasp it. *Boso.* You ought not so much to fear this, because you should call to mind, on the other hand, that it often happens, in the discussion of some question, that God opens what before lay concealed; and that you should hope for the grace of God, because if you liberally impart those things which you have freely received, you will be worthy to receive higher things, to which you have not yet attained. *Anselm.* There is also another thing, on account of which I think this subject can hardly, or not at all, be discussed between us comprehensively; since, for this purpose,

there is required a knowledge of Power and Necessity and Will and certain other subjects, which are so related to one another, that none of them can be fully examined without the rest; and so the discussion of these topics requires a separate labor, which, though not very easy, in my opinion, is by no means useless; for ignorance of these subjects makes certain things difficult, which by acquaintance with them become easy.

Boso. You can speak so briefly with regard to these things, each in its place, that we may both have all that is requisite for the present object, and what remains to be said we can put off to another time.

Anselm. This also much disinclines me from your request, not only that the subject is important, but as it is of a form fair above the sons of men, so is it of a wisdom fair above the intellect of men. On this account, I fear, lest, as I am wont to be incensed against sorry artists, when I see our Lord himself painted in an unseemly figure; so also it may fall out with me, if I should undertake to exhibit so rich a theme in rough and vulgar diction. *Boso.* Even this ought not to deter you, because, as you allow any one to talk better if he can, so you preclude none from writing more elegantly, if your language does not please him. But, to cut you off from all excuses, you are not to fulfil this request of mine for the learned but for me, and those asking the same thing with me.

Anselm. Since I observe your earnestness and that of those who desire this thing with you, out of love and pious zeal, I will try, to the best of my ability (with the assistance of God and your prayers, which when making this request you have often promised me), not so much to make plain what you inquire about, as to inquire with you. But I wish all that I say to be received with this understanding, that, if I shall have said anything which higher authority does not corroborate, though I appear to demonstrate it by argument, yet it is not to be received with any further confidence, than as so appearing to me for the time, until God in some way make a clearer revelation to me. But if I am in any measure able to set your inquiry at rest, it should be concluded that a wiser than I will be able to do this more fully; nay, we must understand, that for all that a man can say or know, still deeper grounds of so great a truth lie concealed.

Boso. Suffer me, therefore, to make use of the words of infidels; for it is proper for us, when we seek to investigate the reasonableness of our faith, to propose the objections of those

who are wholly unwilling to submit to the same faith, without the support of reason. For although they appeal to reason because they do not believe, but we, on the other hand, because we do believe; nevertheless the thing sought is one and the same. And if you bring up anything in reply, which sacred authority seems to oppose, let it be mine to urge this inconsistency until you disprove it. *Anselm.* Speak on according to your pleasure.

CHAP. III. *Objections of infidels and replies of believers.*

Boso. Infidels ridiculing our simplicity charge upon us that we do injustice and dishonor to God, when we affirm that he descended into the womb of a virgin, that he was born of woman, that he grew on the nourishment of milk and the food of men; and, passing over many other things which seem incompatible with Deity, that he endured fatigue, hunger, thirst, stripes and crucifixion among thieves. *Anselm.* We do no injustice or dishonor to God, but give him thanks with all the heart, praising and proclaiming the ineffable height of his compassion. For the more astonishing a thing it is and beyond expectation, that he has restored us from so great and deserved ills in which we were, to so great and unmerited blessings which we had forfeited; by so much the more has he shown his more exceeding love and tenderness towards us. For did they but carefully consider, how fitly in this way human redemption is secured, they would not ridicule our simplicity, but would rather join with us in praising the wise beneficence of God. For, as death came upon the human race by the disobedience of man, it was fitting that by man's obedience life should be restored. And, as sin, the cause of our condemnation, had its origin from a woman, so ought the author of our righteousness and salvation to be born of a woman. And so also was it proper that the devil, who, being man's tempter, had conquered him in eating of the tree, should be vanquished by man in the suffering of the tree which man bore. Many other things, also, if we carefully examine them, give a certain indescribable beauty to our redemption as thus procured.

CHAP. IV. *How these things appear not decisive to infidels, and merely like so many pictures.*

Boso. These things must be admitted to be beautiful, and like

so many pictures; but, if they have no solid foundation, they do not appear sufficient to infidels, as reasons why we ought to believe that God wished to suffer the things which we speak of. For when one wishes to make a picture, he selects something substantial to paint it upon, so that his picture may remain. For no one paints in water or in air, because no traces of the picture remain in them. Wherefore, when we hold up to infidels these harmonious proportions, which you speak of, as so many pictures of the real thing, since they do not think this belief of ours a reality, but only a fiction, they consider us as it were to be painting upon a cloud. Therefore the rational existence of the truth must first be shown, I mean, the necessity, which proves that God ought to or could have condescended to those things which we affirm. Afterwards, to make the body of the truth, so to speak, shine forth more clearly, these harmonious proportions, like pictures of the body, must be described. *Anselm.* Does not the reason why God ought to do the things we speak of, seem absolute enough, when we consider that the human race, that work of his so very precious, was wholly ruined, and that it was not seemly that the purpose which God had made concerning man should fall to the ground; and, moreover, that this purpose could not be carried into effect, unless the human race were delivered by their Creator himself.

CHAP. V. *How the redemption of man could not be effected by any other being but God.*

Boso. If this deliverance were said to be effected somehow by any other being than God (whether it were an angelic or a human being), the mind of man would receive it far more patiently. For God could have made some man without sin, not of a sinful substance, and not a descendant of any man, but just as he made Adam, and by this man it should seem that the work we speak of could have been done. *Anselm.* Do you not perceive that, if any other being should rescue man from eternal death, man would rightly be adjudged as the servant of that being? Now if this be so, he would in no wise be restored to that dignity, which would have been his, had he never sinned. For he, who was to be through eternity only the servant of God and an equal with the holy angels, would now be the servant of a being who was not God, and whom the angels did not serve.

CHAP. VI. *How infidels find fault with us, for saying that God has redeemed us by his death, and thus has shown his love towards us, and that he came to overcome the devil for us.*

Boso. This they greatly wonder at, because we call this redemption a release. For, say they, in what custody or imprisonment, or under whose power were you held, that God could not free you from it, without purchasing your redemption by so many sufferings, and finally by his own blood? And when we tell them, that he freed us from our sins, and from his own wrath, and from hell, and from the power of the devil, whom he came to vanquish for us, because we were unable to do it, and that he purchased for us the kingdom of heaven; and that, by doing all these things, he manifested the greatness of his love towards us; they answer: If you say that God, who, as you believe, created the universe by a word, could not do all these things by a simple command, you contradict yourselves, for you make him powerless. Or, if you grant that he could have done these things in some other way, but did not wish to, how can you vindicate his wisdom, when you assert that he desired, without any reason, to suffer things so unbecoming? For these things which you bring up, are all regulated by his will; for the wrath of God is nothing but his desire to punish. If, then, he does not desire to punish the sins of men, man is free from his sins, and from the wrath of God, and from hell, and from the power of the devil, all which things are the sufferings of sin; and, what he had lost by reason of these sins, he now regains. For, in whose power is hell, or the devil? Or, whose is the kingdom of heaven, if it be not his who created all things? Whatever things, therefore, you dread or hope for, all lie subject to his will, whom nothing can oppose. If, then, God were unwilling to save the human race, in any other way than that you mention, when he could have done it by his simple will; observe, to say the least, how you disparage his wisdom. For, if a man without motive should do, by severe toil, a thing which he could have done in some easy way, no one would consider him a wise man. As to your statement, that God has shown in this way how much he loved you, there is no argument to support this, unless it be proved that he could not otherwise have saved man. For, if he could not have done it otherwise, then it was, indeed, necessary for him to manifest his love in this way. But now, when he could have saved man differently, why is it, that, for the sake of displaying his love, he

does and suffers the things which you enumerate? For does he not show good angels how much he loves them, though he suffer no such things as these for them? As to what you say of his coming to vanquish the devil for you, with what meaning dare you allege this? Is not the omnipotence of God everywhere enthroned? How is it, then, that God must needs come down from heaven to vanquish the devil? These are the objections with which infidels think they can withstand us.

CHAP. VII. *How the devil had no justice on his side against man; and why it was, that he seemed to have had it, and why God could have freed man in this way.*

Moreover, I do not see the force of that argument, which we are wont to make use of, that God, in order to save men, was bound, as it were, to try a contest with the devil in justice, before he did in strength, so that, when the devil should put to death that being in whom there was nothing worthy of death, and who was God, he should justly lose his power over sinners; and that, if it were not so, God would have used undue force against the devil, since the devil had a rightful ownership of man, for the devil had not seized man with violence, but man had freely surrendered to him. It is true that this might well enough be said, if the devil or man belonged to any other being than God, or were in the power of any but God. But since neither the devil nor man belong to any but God, and neither can exist without the exertion of Divine power, what cause ought God to try with his own creature (*de suo, in suo*), or what should he do but punish his servant, who had seduced his fellow-servant to desert their common Lord and come over to himself; who, a traitor, had taken to himself a fugitive; a thief, had taken to himself a fellow-thief, with what he had stolen from his Lord. For when one was stolen from his Lord by the persuasions of the other, both were thieves. For what could be more just than for God to do this? Or, should God, the judge of all, snatch man, thus held, out of the power of him who holds him so unrighteously, either for the purpose of punishing him in some other way, than by means of the devil, or of sparing him, what injustice would there be in this? For, though man deserved to be tormented by the devil, yet the devil tormented him unjustly. For man merited punishment, and there was no more suitable way for him to be punished, than by that being to whom he had

given his consent to sin. But the infliction of punishment was nothing meritorious in the devil; on the other hand, he was even more unrighteous in this, because he was not led to it by a love of justice, but urged on by a malicious impulse. For he did not do this at the command of God, but God's inconceivable wisdom, which happily controls even wickedness, permitted it. And, in my opinion, those who think that the devil has any right in holding man, are brought to this belief by seeing that man is justly exposed to the tormenting of the devil, and that God in justice permits this; and therefore they suppose that the devil rightly inflicts it. For the very same thing, from opposite points of view, is sometimes both just and unjust, and hence, by those who do not carefully inspect the matter, is deemed wholly just or wholly unjust. Suppose, for example, that one strikes an innocent person unjustly, and hence justly deserves to be beaten himself; if, however, the one who was beaten, though he ought not to avenge himself, yet does strike the person who beat him, then he does it unjustly. And hence this violence, on the part of the man who returns the blow, is unjust, because he ought not to avenge himself; but as far as he, who received the blow, is concerned, it is just, for since he gave a blow unjustly, he justly deserves to receive one in return. Therefore, from opposite views, the same action is both just and unjust, for it may chance that one person shall consider it only just, and another only unjust. So also the devil is said to torment men justly, because God in justice permits this, and man in justice suffers it. But when man is said to suffer justly, it is not meant that his just suffering is inflicted by the hand of justice itself, but that he is punished by the just judgment of God. But if that written decree is brought up, which the Apostle says was made against us, and cancelled by the death of Christ; and if any one thinks that it was intended by this decree, that the devil, as if under the writing of a sort of compact, should justly demand sin and the punishment of sin, of man, before Christ suffered, as a debt for the first sin to which he tempted man, so that in this way he seems to prove his right over man, I do not by any means think that it is to be so understood. For that writing is not of the devil; because it is called the writing of a decree of the devil, but of God. For by the just judgment of God it was decreed, and, as it were, confirmed by writing, that, since man had sinned, he should not henceforth of himself have the power to avoid sin

or the punishment of sin; for the spirit is out-going and not returning [*est enim spiritus vadens et non rediens*]; and he who sins, ought not to escape with impunity, unless pity spare the sinner, and deliver and restore him. Wherefore we ought not to believe that, on account of this writing, there can be found any justice on the part of the devil, in his tormenting man. In fine, as there is never any injustice in a good angel, so in an evil angel there can be no justice at all. There was no reason, therefore, as respects the devil, why God should not make use of his own power against him, for the liberation of man.

CHAP. VIII. *How, although the acts of Christ's condescension which we speak of, do not belong to his divinity, it yet seems improper to infidels, that these things should be said of him even as a man; and why it appears to them, that this man did not suffer death of his own will.*

Anselm. The will of God ought to be a sufficient reason for us, when he does anything, though we cannot see why he does it. For the will of God is never irrational. *Boso.* That is very true, if it be granted that God does wish the thing in question; but many will never allow that God does wish anything, if it be inconsistent with reason. *Anselm.* What do you find inconsistent with reason, in our confessing that God desired those things, which make up our belief with regard to his incarnation? *Boso.* This, in brief: that the Most High should stoop to things so lowly, that the Almighty should do a thing with such toil. *Anselm.* They who speak thus, do not understand our belief. For we affirm that the Divine nature is beyond doubt impassible, and that God cannot at all be brought down from his exaltation, nor *toil* in anything, which he wishes to effect. But we say that the Lord Jesus Christ is very God and very man, one person in two natures, and two natures in one person. When, therefore, we speak of God as enduring any humiliation or infirmity, we do not refer to the majesty of that nature, which cannot suffer; but to the feebleness of the human constitution, which He assumed. And so there remains no ground of objection against our faith. For in this way, we intend no debasement of the Divine nature, but we teach that one person is both Divine and human. In the incarnation of God, there is no lowering of the Deity; but the nature of man we believe to be exalted. *Boso.* Be it so; let nothing be referred to the Divine nature, which is

spoken of Christ after the manner of human weakness; but how will it ever be made out a just or reasonable thing that God should treat, or suffer to be treated in such a manner, that man whom the Father called his beloved Son in whom he was well pleased, and whom the Son made himself? For what justice is there in *his* suffering death for the sinner, who was the most just of all men? What man, if he condemned the innocent to free the guilty, would not himself be judged worthy of condemnation? And so the matter seems to return to the same incongruity, which is mentioned above. For if he could not save sinners in any other way than by condemning the just, where is his omnipotence? If, however, he could, but did not wish to, how shall we sustain his wisdom and justice? *Anselm.* God the Father did not treat that man as you seem to suppose, nor put to death the innocent for the guilty. For the Father did not compel him to suffer death, or even allow him to be slain, against his will, but of his own accord he endured death for the salvation of men. *Boso.* Though it were not against his will, since he agreed to the will of the Father; yet the Father seems to have bound him, as it were, by his injunction. For it is said, that Christ "humbled himself, being made obedient to the Father even unto death, and that the death of the cross. For which cause God also hath highly exalted him;" and that "he learned obedience from the things which he suffered;" and that "God spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all." And likewise the Son says: "I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." And when about to suffer, he says: "As the Father hath given me commandment, so I do." Again: "The cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" And, at another time: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt." And again: "Father, if this cup may not pass from me, except I drink it, thy will be done." In all these passages, it would rather appear, that Christ endured death by the constraint of obedience, than by the inclination of his own free will.

CHAP. IX. *How it was of his own accord that he died, and what this means: "he was made obedient even unto death;" and: "for which cause God hath highly exalted him;" and: "I came not to do mine own will;" and: "he spared not his own Son;" and: "not as I will, but as thou wilt."*

Anselm. It seems to me that you do not rightly understand the difference between what he did at the demand of obedience, and what he suffered, not demanded by obedience, but inflicted on him, because he kept his obedience perfect. *Boso.* I need to have you explain it more clearly. *Anselm.* Why did the Jews persecute him even unto death? *Boso.* For nothing else, but that, in word and in life, he invariably maintained truth and justice. *Anselm.* I believe that God demands this of every rational being, and every being owes this in obedience to God. *Boso.* We ought to acknowledge this. *Anselm.* That man, therefore, owed this obedience to God the Father, humanity to Deity; and the Father claimed it from him. *Boso.* There is no doubt of this. *Anselm.* Now you see what he did, under the demand of obedience. *Boso.* Very true, and I see also what infliction he endured, because he stood firm in obedience. For death was inflicted on him for his perseverance in obedience, and he endured it; but I do not understand how it is that obedience did not demand this. *Anselm.* Ought man to suffer death, if he had never sinned, or should God demand this of him? *Boso.* It is on this account, that we believe that man would not have been subject to death, and that God would not have exacted this of him; but I should like to hear the reason of the thing from you. *Anselm.* You acknowledge that the intelligent creature was made holy, and for this purpose, viz. to be happy in the enjoyment of God. *Boso.* Yes. *Anselm.* You surely will not think it proper for God to make his creature miserable without fault, when he had created him holy that he might enjoy a state of blessedness. For it would be a miserable thing for man to die against his will. *Boso.* It is plain that, if man had not sinned, God ought not to compel him to die. *Anselm.* God did not, therefore, compel Christ to die; but he suffered death of his own will, not yielding up his life as an act of obedience, but on account of his obedience in maintaining holiness; for he held out so firmly in this obedience, that he met death on account of it. It may, indeed, be said, that the Father commanded him to die, when he enjoined that upon him,

on account of which he met death. It was in this sense, then, that "as the Father gave him the commandment, so he did, and the cup which He gave to him, he drank; and he was made obedient to the Father, even unto death;" and thus "he learned obedience from the things which he suffered," that is, how far obedience should be maintained. Now the word "didicit," which is used, can be understood in two ways. For either "didicit" is written for this: he caused others to learn; or it is used, because he did learn by experience what he had an understanding of before. Again, when the Apostle had said: "he humbled himself, being made obedient even unto death, and that the death of the cross," he added: "wherefore God also hath exalted him and given him a name, which is above every name." And this is similar to what David said: "he drank of the brook in the way, therefore did he lift up the head." For it is not meant that he could not have attained his exaltation in any other way, but by obedience unto death; nor is it meant, that his exaltation was conferred on him, only as a reward of his obedience (for he himself said before he suffered, that all things had been committed to him by the Father, and that all things belonging to the Father were his); but the expression is used because he had agreed with the Father and the Holy Spirit, that there was no other way to reveal to the world the height of his omnipotence, than by his death. For if a thing do not take place, except on condition of something else, it is not improperly said to occur by reason of that thing. For if we intend to do a thing, but mean to do something else first, by means of which it may be done; when the first thing which we wish to do is done, if the result is such as we intended, it is properly said to be on account of the other; since that is now done, which caused the delay; for it had been determined that the first thing should not be done, without the other. If, for instance, I propose to cross a river, only in a boat, though I can cross it in a boat or on horseback, and suppose that I delay crossing, because the boat is gone; but if afterwards I cross, when the boat has returned, it may be properly said of me: the boat was ready, and therefore he crossed. And we not only use this form of expression, when it is by means of a thing, which we desire should take place first, but also when we intend to do something else, not by means of that thing, but only after it. For if one delays taking food, because he has

not to-day attended the celebration of mass; when that has been done which he wished to do first, it is not improper to say to him: now take food, for you have now done that, for which you delayed taking food. Far less, therefore, is the language strange, when Christ is said to be exalted on this account, because he endured death; for it was through this, and after this, that he determined to accomplish his exaltation. This may be understood also in the same way, as that passage, in which it is said that our Lord increased in wisdom, and in favor with God; not that this was really the case, but that he deputed himself, as if it were so. For he was exalted after his death, as if it were really on account of that. Moreover, that saying of his: "I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me," is precisely like that other saying: "My doctrine is not mine;" for what one does not have of himself, but of God, he ought not to call his own, but God's. Now no one has the truth which he teaches, or a holy will, of himself, but of God. Christ, therefore, came not to do his own will, but that of the Father; for his holy will was not derived from his humanity, but from his divinity. For that sentence: "God spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all," means nothing more, than that He did not rescue him. For there are found in the Bible many things like this. Again, when he says: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt;" and "If this cup may not pass from me, except I drink it, thy will be done;" he signifies, by his own will, the natural desire of safety, in accordance with which human nature shrank from the anguish of death. But he speaks of the will of the Father, not because the Father preferred the death of the Son to his life; but because the Father was not willing to rescue the human race, unless man were to do even as great a thing as was signified in the death of Christ. Since reason did not demand of another what he could not do, therefore, the Son says that he desires his own death. For he preferred to suffer, rather than that the human race should be lost; as if he were to say to the Father: "Since thou dost not desire the reconciliation of the world to take place in any other way, in this respect, I see that thou desirest my death; let thy will, therefore, be done, that is, let my death take place, so that the world may be reconciled to thee." For we often say that one desires a thing, because he

does not choose something else, the choice of which would preclude the existence of that which he is said to desire; for instance, when we say that he, who does not choose to close the window, through which the draft is admitted, which puts out the light, wishes the light to be extinguished. So the Father desired the death of the Son, because he was not willing that the world should be saved in any other way, except by man's doing so great a thing, as that which I have mentioned. And this, since none other could accomplish it, availed as much with the Son, who so earnestly desired the salvation of man, as if the Father had commanded him to die; and, therefore, "as the Father gave him commandment, so he did, and the cup which the Father gave to him, he drank, being obedient even unto death."

CHAP. X. *Likewise on the same topics; and how otherwise they can be correctly explained.*

It is also a fair interpretation, that it was by that same holy will, by which the Son wished to die for the salvation of the world, that the Father gave him commandment (yet not by compulsion), and the cup of suffering, and spared him not, but gave him up for us, and desired his death; and that the Son himself was obedient even unto death, and learned obedience from the things which he suffered. For as with regard to that will, which led him to a holy life, he did not have it as a human being of himself, but of the Father; so also that will, by which he desired to die for the accomplishment of so great good, he could not have had, but from the Father of lights, from whom is every good and perfect gift. And as the Father is said to draw by imparting an inclination, so there is nothing improper in asserting that he moves man. For as the Son says of the Father: "No man cometh to me except the Father draw him," he might as well have said, except he move him. In like manner, also, could he have declared: "No man layeth down his life for my sake, except the Father move or draw him." For since a man is drawn or moved, by his will, to that which he invariably chooses, it is not improper to say, that God draws or moves him, when he gives him this will. And in this drawing or impelling, it is not to be understood, that there is any constraint, but a free and grateful clinging to the holy will, which has been given. If then it cannot be denied, that the Father

drew or moved the Son to death, by giving him that will; who does not see, that, in the same manner, he gave him commandment, to endure death of his own accord, and to take the cup, which he freely drank. And if it is right to say, that the Son spared not himself, but gave himself for us, of his own will, who will deny, that it is right to say that the Father, of whom he had this will, did not spare him, but gave him up for us, and desired his death? In this way, also, by following the will received from the Father invariably, and of his own accord, the Son became obedient to Him, even unto death; and learned obedience from the things which he suffered; that is, he learned how great was the work to be accomplished by obedience. For this is real and sincere obedience, when a rational being, not of compulsion, but freely, follows the will received from God. In other ways, also, we can properly explain the Father's desire that the Son should die, though these would appear sufficient. For as we say that he desires a thing who causes another to desire it; so, also, we say that he desires a thing, who approves of the desire of another, though he does not cause that desire. Thus when we see a man, who desires to endure pain with fortitude, for the accomplishment of some good design; though we acknowledge, that we wish to have him endure that pain, yet we do not choose, nor take pleasure in, his suffering, but in his choice. We are, also, accustomed to say that he, who can prevent a thing, but does not, desires the thing, which he does not prevent. Since, therefore, the will of the Son pleased the Father, and he did not prevent him from choosing, or from fulfilling his choice; it is proper to say, that he wished the Son to endure death so piously and for so great an object, though he was not pleased with his suffering. Moreover, he said, that the cup must not pass from him, except he drank it, not because he could not have escaped death, had he chosen to; but because, as has been said, the world could not otherwise be saved; and it was his fixed choice to suffer death, rather than that the world should not be saved. It was for *this* reason, also, that he used those words, viz. to teach the human race that there was no other salvation for them, but by his death; and not to show that he had no power at all to avoid death. For whatsoever things are said of him, similar to these which have been mentioned, they are all to be explained in accordance with the belief that he died, not by compulsion, but of free choice. For he was

omnipotent, and it is said of him, when he was offered up, that he desired it. And he says himself: "I lay down my life, that I may take it again; no man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." A man cannot, therefore, be properly said to have been driven to a thing, which he does of his own power and will. *Boso.* But this simple fact, that God allows him to be so treated, even if he were willing, does not seem becoming for such a Father, in respect to such a Son. *Anselm.* Yes, it is of all things most proper that such a Father should acquiesce with such a Son in his desire, if it be praiseworthy as relates to the honor of God, and useful for man's salvation, which would not otherwise be effected. *Boso.* The question which still troubles us, is, how the death of the Son can be proved reasonable and necessary. For otherwise, it does not seem that the Son ought to desire it, or the Father compel or permit it. For the question is, why God could not save man in some other way, and if so, why he wished to do it in this way? For it both seems unbecoming for God to have saved man in this way; and it is not clear, how the death of the Son avails for the salvation of man. For it is a strange thing if God so delights in, or requires the blood of the innocent, that he neither chooses, nor is able, to spare the guilty, without the sacrifice of the innocent. *Anselm.* Since, in this inquiry, you take the place of those who are unwilling to believe anything, not previously proved by reason, I wish to have it understood between us, that we do not admit anything in the least unbecoming to be ascribed to the Deity, and that we do not reject the *smallest* reason if it be not opposed by a greater. For as it is impossible to attribute anything in the least unbecoming to God; so any reason, however small; if not overbalanced by a greater, has the force of necessity. *Boso.* In this matter, I accept nothing more willingly, than that this agreement should be preserved between us in common. *Anselm.* The question concerns only the incarnation of God, and those things which we believe with regard to his taking human nature. *Boso.* It is so. *Anselm.* Let us suppose, then, that the incarnation of God, and the things that we affirm of him as man, had never taken place; and be it agreed between us, that man was made for happiness, which cannot be attained in this life, and that no being can ever arrive at happiness, save by freedom from sin, and that no man passes this life with-

out sin. Let us take for granted, also, the other things, the belief of which is necessary for eternal salvation. *Boso.* I grant it; for in these there is nothing which seems unbecoming or impossible for God. *Anselm.* Therefore, in order that man may attain happiness, remission of sin is necessary. *Boso.* We all hold this.

CHAP. XI. *What it is to sin, and to make satisfaction for sin.*

Anselm. We must needs inquire, therefore, in what manner God puts away men's sins; and, in order to do this more plainly, let us first consider what it is to sin, and what it is to make satisfaction for sin. *Boso.* It is yours to explain, and mine to listen. *Anselm.* If man or angel always rendered to God his due, he would never sin. *Boso.* I cannot deny that. *Anselm.* Therefore to sin is nothing else, than not to render to God his due. *Boso.* What is the debt, which we owe to God? *Anselm.* Every wish of a rational creature should be subject to the will of God. *Boso.* Nothing is more true. *Anselm.* This is the debt which man and angel owe to God, and no one who pays this debt commits sin; but every one who does not pay it sins. This is justice, or uprightness of will, which makes a being just or upright in heart, that is, in will; and this is the sole and complete debt of honor, which we owe to God, and which God requires of us. For it is such a will only, when it can be exercised, that does works pleasing to God; and when this will cannot be exercised, it is pleasing of itself alone, since without it no work is acceptable. He who does not render this honor which is due to God, robs God of his own, and dishonors him; and this is sin. Moreover, so long as he does not restore what he has taken away, he remains in fault; and it will not suffice merely to restore what has been taken away, but, considering the contempt offered, he ought to restore more than he took away. For as one who imperils another's safety, does not enough by merely restoring his safety, without making some compensation for the anguish incurred; so he who violates another's honor, does not enough by merely rendering honor again, but must, according to the extent of the injury done, make restoration in some way satisfactory to the person whom he has dishonored. We must also observe, that when any one pays what he has unjustly taken away, he ought to give something, which could not have been demanded of him, had he

not stolen what belonged to another. So then, every one who sins, ought to pay back the honor of which he has robbed God; and this is the satisfaction which every sinner owes to God. *Boso.* Since we have determined to follow reason in all these things, I am unable to bring any objection against them, although you somewhat startle me.

CHAP. XII. *Whether it were proper for God to put away sins by compassion alone, without any payment of the debt.*

Anselm. Let us return and consider, whether it were proper for God to put away sins, by compassion alone, without any payment of the honor taken from him. *Boso.* I do not see why it is not proper. *Anselm.* To remit sin in this manner is nothing else, than not to punish; and since it is not right to cancel sin, without compensation or punishment; if it be not punished, then is it passed by undischarged. *Boso.* What you say is reasonable. *Anselm.* It is not fitting for God to pass over anything in his kingdom undischarged. *Boso.* If I wish to oppose this, I fear to sin. *Anselm.* It is, therefore, not proper for God thus to pass over sin unpunished. *Boso.* Thus it follows. *Anselm.* There is also another thing which follows, if sin be passed by unpunished, viz. that with God there will be no difference between the guilty and the not guilty; and this is unbecoming to God. *Boso.* I cannot deny it. *Anselm.* Observe this also. Every one knows that justice to man is regulated by law, so that, according to the requirements of law, the measure of award is bestowed by God. *Boso.* This is our belief. *Anselm.* But if sin is neither paid for nor punished, it is subject to no law. *Boso.* I cannot conceive it to be otherwise. *Anselm.* Injustice, therefore, if it is cancelled by compassion alone, is more free than justice; which seems very inconsistent. And to these is also added a further incongruity, viz. that it makes injustice like God. For as God is subject to no law, so neither is injustice. *Boso.* I cannot withstand your reasoning. But when God commands us in every case to forgive those who trespass against us, it seems inconsistent to enjoin a thing upon us, which it is not proper for him to do himself. *Anselm.* There is no inconsistency in God's commanding us, not to take upon ourselves, what belongs to Him alone. For to execute vengeance belongs to none but Him, who is Lord of all; for when the powers of the world rightly accomplish this end, God himself

does it, who appointed them for the purpose. *Boso.* You have obviated the difficulty, which I thought to exist; but there is another, to which I would like to have your answer. For since God is so free as to be subject to no law, and to the judgment of no one, and is so merciful, as that nothing more merciful can be conceived; and nothing is right or fit save as he wills; it seems a strange thing for us to say, that he is wholly unwilling or unable to put away an injury done to himself, when we are wont to apply to him for indulgence, with regard to those offences which we commit against others. *Anselm.* What you say of God's liberty and choice and compassion, is true; but we ought so to interpret these things, as that they may not seem to interfere with His dignity. For there is no liberty, except as regards what is best or fitting; nor should that be called mercy, which does anything improper for the Divine character. Moreover, when it is said that what God wishes is just, and that what He does not wish is unjust, we must not understand that, if God wished anything improper, it would be just, simply because he wished it. For if God wishes to lie, we must not conclude that it is right to lie, but rather that he is not God. For no will can ever wish to lie, unless truth in it is impaired, nay, unless the will itself be impaired by forsaking truth. When, then, it is said: "If God wishes to lie;" the meaning is simply this: "If the nature of God is such, as that he wishes to lie;" and, therefore, it does not follow that falsehood is right, except it be understood in the same manner, as when we speak of two impossible things: "If this be true, then that follows; because neither *this* nor *that* is true;" as if a man should say: "Supposing water to be dry, and fire to be moist;" for neither is the case. Therefore, with regard to these things, to speak the whole truth: If God desires a thing, it is right that he should desire that which involves no unfitness. For if God chooses that it should rain, it is right that it should rain; and if he desires that any man should die, then is it right that he should die. Wherefore, if it be not fitting for God to do anything unjustly, or out of course, it does not belong to his liberty or compassion or will, to let the sinner go unpunished, who makes no return to God of what the sinner has defrauded him. *Boso.* You remove from me every possible objection, which I had thought of bringing against you. *Anselm.* Yet observe, why it is not fitting for God to do this. *Boso.* I listen readily to whatever you say.

CHAP. XIII. *How nothing less was to be endured, in the order of things, than that the creature should take away the honor due the Creator, and not restore what he takes away.*

Anselm. In the order of things, there is nothing less to be endured, than that the creature should take away the honor due the Creator, and not restore what he has taken away. *Boso.* Nothing is more plain than this. *Anselm.* But there is no greater injustice suffered, than that by which so great an evil must be endured. *Boso.* This, also, is plain. *Anselm.* I think, therefore, that you will not say, that God ought to endure a thing, than which no greater injustice is suffered, viz. that the creature should not restore to God what he has taken away. *Boso.* No; I think it should be wholly denied. *Anselm.* Again, if there is nothing greater or better than God; there is nothing more just, than supreme justice, which maintains God's honor in the arrangement of things, and which is nothing else but God himself. *Boso.* There is nothing clearer than this. *Anselm.* Therefore God maintains nothing with more justice, than the honor of his own dignity. *Boso.* I must agree with you. *Anselm.* Does it seem to you, that he wholly preserves it, if he allows himself to be so defrauded of it, as that he should neither receive satisfaction, nor punish the one defrauding him. *Boso.* I dare not say so. *Anselm.* Therefore the honor taken away must be repaid, or punishment must follow; otherwise, either God will not be just to himself, or he will be weak in respect to both parties; and this it is impious even to think of. *Boso.* I think that nothing more reasonable can be said.

CHAP. XIV. *How the honor of God exists in the punishment of the wicked.*

Boso. But I wish to hear from you, whether the punishment of the sinner is an honor to God, or how it is an honor. For if the punishment of the sinner is not for God's honor, when the sinner does not pay what he took away, but is punished, God loses his honor so that he cannot recover it. And this seems in contradiction to the things which have been said. *Anselm.* It is impossible for God to lose his honor; for either the sinner pays his debt of his own accord, or, if he refuse, God takes it from him. For either man renders due submission to God, of his own will, by avoiding sin or making payment, or else God subjects him to himself by torments, even against man's will, and thus shows that

he is the Lord of man, though man refuses to acknowledge it of his own accord. And here, we must observe, that as man in sinning takes away what belongs to God, so God in punishing gets in return what pertains to man. For not only does that belong to a man, which he has in present possession, but also that which it is in his power to have. Therefore, since man was so made, as to be able to attain happiness by avoiding sin; if, on account of his sin, he is deprived of happiness and every good, he repays, from his own inheritance, what he has stolen, though he repay it against his will. For although God does not apply what he takes away to any object of his own, as man transfers the money which he has taken from another to his own use; yet what he takes away, serves the purpose of his own honor, for this very reason, that it is taken away. For by this act he shows that the sinner, and all that pertains to him, are under his subjection.

CHAP. XV. *Whether God suffers his honor to be violated even in the least degree.*

Boso. What you say satisfies me. But there is still another point which I should like to have you answer. For if, as you make out, God ought to sustain his own honor, why does he allow it to be violated, even in the least degree? For what is in any way made liable to injury, is not entirely and perfectly preserved.

Anselm. Nothing can be added to or taken from the honor of God. For this honor which belongs to him, is in no way subject to injury or change. But as the individual creature preserves, naturally or by reason, the condition belonging, and, as it were, allotted to him, he is said to obey and honor God; and to this, rational nature, which possesses intelligence, is especially bound. And when the being chooses what he ought, he honors God; not by bestowing anything upon him, but because he brings himself freely under God's will and disposal, and maintains his own condition in the universe, and the beauty of the universe itself, as far as in him lies. But when he does not choose what he ought, he dishonors God, as far as the being himself is concerned, because he does not submit himself freely to God's disposal. And he disturbs the order and beauty of the universe, as relates to himself, although he cannot injure nor tarnish the power and majesty of God. For if those things which are held together in the circuit of the heavens, desire to be elsewhere than under the heavens, or to be further removed from the heav-

ens, there is no place where they can be, but under the heavens, nor can they fly from the heavens without also approaching them. For both whence and whither and in what way they go, they are still under the heavens; and if they are at a greater distance from one part of them, they are only so much nearer to the opposite part. And so, though man or evil angel refuse to submit to the Divine will and appointment, yet he cannot escape it; for if he wishes to fly from a will that commands, he falls into the power of a will that punishes. And if you ask whither he goes, it is only under the permission of that will; and even this wayward choice or action of his becomes subservient, under infinite wisdom, to the order and beauty of the universe before spoken of. For when it is understood, that God brings good out of many forms of evil, then the satisfaction for sin freely given, or if this be not given, the exaction of punishment, hold their own place and orderly beauty in the same universe. For if Divine wisdom were not to insist upon these things, when wickedness tries to disturb the right appointment, there would be, in the very universe which God ought to control, an unseemliness, springing from the violation of the beauty of arrangement, and God would appear to be deficient in his management. And these two things are not only unfitting, but consequently impossible; so that satisfaction or punishment must needs follow every sin. *Boso.* You have relieved my objection. *Anselm.* It is then plain, that no one can honor or dishonor God, as he is in himself; but the creature, as far as he is concerned, appears to do this, when he submits or opposes his will to the will of God. *Boso.* I know of nothing which can be said against this. *Anselm.* Let me add something to it. *Boso.* Go on, until I am weary of listening.

CHAP. XVI. *The reason why the number of angels who fell, must be made up from men.*

Anselm. It was proper that God should design to make up for the number of angels that fell, from human nature which he created without sin. *Boso.* This is a part of our belief, but still I should like to have some reason for it. *Anselm.* You mistake me, for we intended to discuss only the incarnation of the Deity, and here you are bringing in other questions. *Boso.* Be not angry with me; "for the Lord loveth a cheerful giver;" and no one shows better how cheerfully he gives what he promises,

than he who gives more than he promises; therefore, tell me freely what I ask. *Anselm.* There is no question that intelligent nature, which finds its happiness, both now and forever, in the contemplation of God, was foreseen by him in a certain reasonable and complete number, so that there would be an unfitness in its being either less or greater. For either God did not know in what number it was best to create rational beings, which is false; or, if he did know, then he appointed such a number as he perceived was most fitting. Wherefore, either the angels who fell, were made so as to be within that number; or, since they were out of that number, they could not continue to exist, and so fell of necessity. But this last is an absurd idea. *Boso.* The truth which you set forth is plain. *Anselm.* Therefore, since they ought to be of that number, either their number should of necessity be made up, or else rational nature, which was foreseen as perfect in number, will remain incomplete. But this cannot be. *Boso.* Doubtless, then, the number must be restored. *Anselm.* But this restoration can only be made from human beings, since there is no other source.

CHAP. XVII. *How other angels cannot take the place of those who fell.*

Boso. Why could not they themselves be restored, or other angels substituted for them? *Anselm.* When you shall see the difficulty of our restoration, you will understand the impossibility of theirs. But other angels cannot be substituted for them on this account (to pass over its apparent inconsistency with the completeness of the first creation), because they ought to be such as the former angels would have been, had they never sinned. But the first angels, in that case, would have persevered without ever witnessing the punishment of sin; which, in respect to the others, who were substituted for them after their fall, was impossible. For two beings, who stand firm in truth, are not equally deserving of praise, if one has never seen the punishment of sin, and the other forever witnesses its eternal reward. For it must not for a moment be supposed that good angels are upheld by the fall of evil angels, but by their own virtue. For, as they would have been condemned together, had the good sinned with the bad, so, had the unholy stood firm with the holy, they would have been likewise upheld. For if, without the fall of a part, the rest could not be upheld; it would follow, either

that none could ever be upheld, or else that it was necessary for some one to fall, in order by his punishment to uphold the rest; but either of these suppositions is absurd. Therefore, had all stood, all would have been upheld in the same manner as those who stood; and this manner I explained, as well as I could, when treating of the reason why God did not bestow perseverance upon the devil. *Boso.* You have proved that the evil angels must be restored from the human race; and from this reasoning it appears, that the number of men chosen will not be less than that of fallen angels. But show, if you can, whether it will be greater.

CHAP. XVIII. *Whether there will be more holy men than evil angels.*

Anselm. If the angels, before any of them fell, existed in that perfect number of which we have spoken, then men were only made to supply the place of the lost angels; and, it is plain, that their number will not be greater. But if that number were not found in all the angels together, then both the loss and the original deficiency must be made up from men, and more men will be chosen than there were fallen angels. And so we shall say, that men were made not only to restore the diminished number, but also to complete the imperfect number. *Boso.* Which is the better theory, that angels were originally made perfect in number, or that they were not? *Anselm.* I will state my views. *Boso.* I cannot ask more of you. *Anselm.* If man was created after the fall of evil angels, as some understand the account in Genesis, I do not think that I can prove from this either of these suppositions positively. For it is possible, I think, that the angels should have been created perfect in number, and that afterwards man was created to complete their number, when it had been lessened; and it is also possible, that they were not perfect in number, because God deferred completing the number, as he does even now, determining in his own time to create man. Wherefore, either God would only complete that which was not yet perfect, or, if it were also diminished, He would restore it. But if the whole creation took place at once, and those days in which Moses appears to describe a successive creation, are not to be understood like such days as ours; I cannot see how angels could have been created perfect in number. Since, if it were so, it seems to me that some, either men or angels, would fall imme-

diately, else in heaven's empire there would be more than the complete number required. If, therefore, all things were created at one and the same time, it should seem that angels, and the first two human beings, formed an incomplete number, so that, if no angel fell, the deficiency alone should be made up, but if any fell, the lost part should be restored; and that human nature, which had stood firm, though weaker than that of angels, might, as it were, justify God, and put the devil to silence, if he were to attribute his fall to weakness. And in case human nature fell, much more would it justify God against the devil, and even against itself, because, though made far weaker and of a mortal race, yet, in the elect, it would rise from its weakness to an estate exalted above that from which the devil was fallen, as far as good angels, to whom it should be equal, were advanced after the overthrow of the evil, because they persevered. From these reasons, I am rather inclined to the belief, that there was not, originally, that complete number of angels necessary to perfect the celestial state; since, supposing that man and angels were not created at the same time, this is possible; and it would follow of necessity, if they were created at the same time, which is the opinion of the majority, because we read: "He, who liveth forever, created all things at once." But if the perfection of the created universe is to be understood as consisting, not so much in the number of beings, as in the number of natures; it follows, that human nature was either made to consummate this perfection, or that it was superfluous, which we should not dare affirm of the nature of the smallest reptile. Wherefore, then, it was made for itself, and not merely to restore the number of beings possessing another nature. From which it is plain, that, even had no angel fallen, men would yet have had their place in the celestial kingdom. And hence it follows, that there was not a perfect number of angels, even before a part fell; otherwise, of necessity some men or angels must fall, because it would be impossible that any should continue beyond the perfect number. *Boso.* You have not labored in vain. *Anselm.* There is, also, as I think, another reason, which supports, in no small degree, the opinion that angels were not created perfect in number. *Boso.* Let us hear it. *Anselm.* Had a perfect number of angels been created, and had man been made only to fill the place of the lost angels, it is plain that, had not some angels fallen from their happiness, man would never have

been exalted to it. *Boso.* We are agreed. *Anselm.* But if any one shall ask: "Since the elect rejoice as much over the fall of angels, as over their own exaltation, because the one can never take place without the other; how can they be justified in this unholy joy, or how shall we say that angels are restored by the substitution of men, if they (the angels) would have remained free from this fault, had they not fallen, viz. from rejoicing over the fall of others?" We reply: Cannot men be made free from this fault? nay, how ought they to be happy with this fault? With what temerity then, do we say, that God neither wishes, nor is able to make this substitution without this fault! *Boso.* Is not the case similar to that of the Gentiles, who were called unto faith, because the Jews rejected it? *Anselm.* No; for had the Jews all believed, yet the Gentiles would have been called; for "in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him." But, since the Jews despised the apostles, this was the immediate occasion of their turning to the Gentiles. *Boso.* I see no way of opposing you. *Anselm.* Whence does that joy, which one has over another's fall, seem to arise? *Boso.* Whence, to be sure, but from the fact, that each individual will be certain, that, had not another fallen, he would never have attained the place where he now is? *Anselm.* If, then, no one had this certainty, there would be no cause for one to rejoice over the doom of another. *Boso.* So it appears. *Anselm.* Think you, that any one of them can have this certainty, if their number shall far exceed that of those who fell? *Boso.* I certainly cannot think that any one would or ought to have it. For how can any one know, whether he were created to restore the part diminished, or to make up that which was not yet complete in the number necessary to constitute the state? But all are sure, that they were made with a view to the perfection of that kingdom. *Anselm.* If, then, there shall be a larger number than that of the fallen angels, no one can or ought to know that he would not have attained this height but for another's fall. *Boso.* That is true. *Anselm.* No one, therefore, will have cause to rejoice over the perdition of another. *Boso.* So it appears. *Anselm.* Since, then, we see, that, if there are more men elected than the number of fallen angels, the incongruity will not follow, which must follow, if there are not more men elected; and since it is impossible that there should be anything incongruous in that celestial state, it becomes a necessary fact, that angels were not

made perfect in number, and that there will be more happy men than doomed angels. *Boso.* I see not how this can be denied. *Anselm.* I think that another reason can be brought to support this opinion. *Boso.* You ought then to present it. *Anselm.* We believe that the material substance of the world must be renewed, and that this will not take place until the number of the elect is accomplished, and that happy kingdom made perfect, and that after its completion there will be no change. Whence it may be reasoned, that God planned to perfect both at the same time ; in order that the inferior nature, which knew not God, might not be perfected before the superior nature, which ought to enjoy God ; and that the inferior, being renewed at the same time with the superior, might, as it were, rejoice in its own way ; yes, that every creature, having so glorious and excellent a consummation, might delight in its Creator and in itself, in turn, rejoicing always after its own manner, so that what the will effects in the rational nature of its own accord, this also the irrational creature naturally shows by the arrangement of God. For we are wont to rejoice in the fame of our ancestors, as when on the birthdays of the saints, we delight with festive triumph, rejoicing in their honor. And this opinion derives support from the fact, that, had not Adam sinned, God might yet put off the completion of that state until the number of men, which he designed, should be made out, and men themselves be transferred, so to speak, to an immortal state of bodily existence. For they had in paradise a kind of immortality, that is, a power not to die, but since it was possible for them to die, this power was not immortal, as if, indeed, they had not been capable of death. But if God determined to bring to perfection, at one and the same time, that intelligent and happy state and this earthly and irrational nature ; it follows, that either that state was not complete in the number of angels, before the destruction of the wicked, but God was waiting to complete it by men, when he should renovate the material nature of the world ; or that, if that kingdom were perfect in number, it was not in confirmation, and its confirmation must be deferred, even had no one sinned, until that renewal of the world, to which we look forward ; or that, if that confirmation could not be deferred so long, the renewal of the world must be hastened, that both events might take place at the same time. But that God should determine to renew the world, immediately after it was made, and to destroy in the very beginning those

things which after this renewal would not exist, before any reason appeared for their creation, is simply absurd. It therefore follows, that, since angels were not complete in number, their confirmation will not be long deferred on this account, because the renewal of a world just created ought soon to take place; for this is not fitting. But that God should wish to put off their confirmation to the future renewing of the world, seems improper, since he so quickly accomplished it in some, and since we know, that, in regard to our first parents, if they had not sinned as they did, he would have confirmed them, as well as the angels who persevered. For, although not yet advanced to that equality with angels to which men were to attain, when the number taken from among them was complete; yet, had they preserved their original holiness, so as not to have sinned, though tempted, they would have been confirmed, with all their offspring, so as never more to sin; just as when they were conquered by sin, they were so weakened as to be unable, in themselves, to live afterwards without sinning. For who dares affirm, that wickedness is more powerful to bind a man in servitude, after he has yielded to it at the first persuasion, than holiness to confirm him in liberty, when he has adhered to it in the original trial? For as human nature, being included in the person of our first parents, was in them wholly won over to sin (with the single exception of that man whom God being able to create from a virgin, was equally able to save from the sin of Adam), so had they not sinned, human nature would have wholly conquered. It therefore remains, that the celestial state was not complete in its original number, but must be completed from among men.

Boso. What you say seems very reasonable to me. But what shall we think of that which is said respecting God: "He hath appointed the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel;" which some, because for the expression "children of Israel," is found sometimes "angels of God," explain in this way, that the number of elect men taken, should be understood as equal to that of good angels? *Anselm.* This is not discordant with the previous opinion, if it be not certain that the number of angels who fell, is the same as that of those who stood. For if there be more elect than evil angels, and elect men must needs be substituted for the evil angels, and it is possible for them to equal the number of the good angels, in that case there will be more holy men than evil angels. But remember with

what condition I undertook to answer your inquiry, viz. that if I say anything not upheld by greater authority, though I appear to demonstrate it, yet it should be received with no further certainty, than as my opinion for the present, until God makes some clearer revelation to me. For I am sure that, if I say anything which plainly opposes the Holy Scriptures, it is false; and if I am aware of it, I will no longer hold it. But if, with regard to subjects, in which opposite opinions may be held without hazard, as that, for instance, which we now discuss; for if we know not whether there are to be more men elected, than the number of the lost angels, and incline to either of these opinions rather than the other; I think the soul is not in danger; if, I say, in questions like this, we explain the Divine words; so as to make them favor different sides, and there is nowhere found anything to decide, beyond doubt, the opinion that should be held; I think there is no censure to be given. As to the passage which you spoke of: "He hath determined the bounds of the people (or tribes) according to the number of the angels of God;" or as another translation has it: "according to the number of the children of Israel;" since both translations either mean the same thing, or are different, without contradicting each other, we may understand that good angels only are intended by both expressions, "angels of God," and "children of Israel," or that elect men only are meant, or that both angels and elect men are included, even the whole celestial kingdom. Or by angels of God, may be understood holy angels only, and, by children of Israel, holy men only; or, by children of Israel, angels only, and by angels of God, holy men. If good angels are intended in both expressions, it is the same as if only "angels of God" had been used; but if the whole heavenly kingdom were included, the meaning is, that a people, that is, the throng of elect men is to be taken, or that there will be a people in this stage of existence, until the appointed number of that kingdom, not yet completed, shall be made up from among men. But I do not now see why angels only, or even angels and holy men together, are meant by the expression "children of Israel;" for it is not improper to call holy men "children of Israel," as they are called "sons of Abraham." And they can also properly be called "angels of God," because they imitate the life of angels, and they are promised in heaven a likeness to and equality with angels, and all who live holy lives are angels of God. Therefore the confessors

or martyrs are so called; for he who declares and bears witness to the truth, he is a messenger of God, that is, his angel. And if a wicked man is called a devil, as our Lord says of Judas, because they are alike in malice; why should not a good man be called an angel, because he follows holiness? Wherefore I think we may say that God hath appointed the bounds of the people according to the number of elect men, because men will exist and there will be a natural increase among them, until the number of elect men is accomplished; and when that occurs, the birth of men, which takes place in this life, will cease. But if by "angels of God" we only understand holy angels, and by "children of Israel" only holy men; it may be explained in two ways: that "God hath appointed the bounds of the people according to the number of the angels of God," viz. either, that so great a people, that is, so many men will be taken as there are holy angels of God, or that a people will continue to exist upon earth, until the number of angels is completed from among men. And I think there is no other possible method of explanation: "he hath appointed the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel," that is, that there will continue to be a people in this stage of existence, as I said above, until the number of holy men is completed. And we infer from either translation that as many men will be taken, as there were angels who remained steadfast. Yet, although lost angels must have their ranks filled by men, it does not follow, that the number of lost angels was equal to that of those who persevered. But if any one affirms this, he will have to find means of invalidating the reasons given above, which prove, I think, that there was not among angels, before the fall, that perfect number before mentioned, and that there are more men to be saved, than the number of evil angels. *Boso.* I by no means regret that I urged you to these remarks about the angels, for it has not been for nought. Now let us return from our digression.

CHAP. XIX. *How man cannot be saved without satisfaction for sin.*

Anselm. It was fitting for God to fill the places of the fallen angels from among men. *Boso.* That is certain. *Anselm.* Therefore there ought to be in the heavenly empire as many men taken as substitutes for the angels as would correspond with the number whose place they shall take, that is, as many

as there are good angels now; otherwise they who fell will not be restored, and it will follow that God either could not accomplish the good which he begun, or he will repent of having undertaken it; either of which is absurd. *Boso*. Truly it is fitting that men should be equal with good angels. *Anselm*. Have good angels ever sinned? *Boso*. No. *Anselm*. Can you think that man, who has sinned, and never made satisfaction to God for his sin, but only been suffered to go unpunished, may become the equal of an angel who has never sinned? *Boso*. These words I can both think of and utter, but can no more perceive their meaning than I can make truth out of falsehood. *Anselm*. Therefore it is not fitting, that God should take sinful man without an atonement, in substitution for lost angels; for truth will not suffer man thus to be raised to an equality with holy beings. *Boso*. Reason shows this. *Anselm*. Consider, also, leaving out the question of equality with the angels, whether God ought, under such circumstances, to raise man to the same or a similar kind of happiness, as that which he had before he sinned. *Boso*. Tell your opinion, and I will attend to it as well as I can. *Anselm*. Suppose a rich man possessed a choice pearl, which had never been defiled, and which could not be taken from his hands without his permission; and that he determined to commit it to the treasury of his dearest and most valuable possessions. *Boso*. I accept your supposition. *Anselm*. What, if he should allow some envious person to take it from him when at supper, though he might have prevented it; and afterwards taking it from supper all soiled and unwashed, should commit it again to his beautiful and loved casket; will you consider him a wise man? *Boso*. How can I? for would it not be far better to keep and preserve his pearl pure, than to have it polluted? *Anselm*. Would not God be acting like this, who held man in paradise, as it were in his own hand, without sin, and destined to the society of angels, and allowed the devil, inflamed with envy, to cast him into the mire of sin, though truly with man's consent? For, had God chosen to restrain the devil, the devil could not have tempted man. Now I say, would not God be acting like this, should he restore man, stained with the defilement of sin, unwashed, that is, without any satisfaction, and always to remain so; should He restore him at once to paradise, from which he had been thrust out? *Boso*. I dare not deny the aptness of your comparison, were God to do this, and therefore do not admit that

he can do this. For it should seem either that he could not accomplish what he designed, or else that he repented of his good intent, neither of which things is possible with God. *Anselm.* Therefore, consider it settled, that, without satisfaction, that is, without voluntary payment of the debt, God can neither pass by the sin unpunished, nor can the sinner attain that happiness, or happiness like that, which he had before he sinned; for man cannot in this way be restored, or become such as he was before he sinned. *Boso.* I am wholly unable to refute your reasoning. But what say you to this: that we pray God, "put away our sins from us," and every nation prays the God of its faith, to put away its sins. For, if we pay our debt, why do we pray God to put it away? Is not God unjust to demand what has already been paid? But if we do not make payment, why do we supplicate in vain that he will do what he cannot do, because it is unbecoming? *Anselm.* He, who does not pay, says in vain: "pardon;" but he who pays, makes supplication, because prayer is properly connected with the payment; for God owes no man anything, but every creature owes God; and, therefore, it does not become man to treat with God as with an equal. But of this it is not now needful for me to answer you. For when you know why Christ died, I think you will see yourself the answer to your question. *Boso.* Your reply with regard to this matter suffices me for the present. And, moreover, you have so clearly shown that no man can attain happiness in sin, or be freed from sin without satisfaction for the trespass, that, even were I so disposed, I could not doubt it.

CHAP. XX. *That satisfaction ought to be proportionate to guilt; and that man is of himself unable to accomplish this.*

Anselm. Neither, I think, will you doubt this, that satisfaction should be proportionate to guilt. *Boso.* Otherwise sin would remain in a manner exempt from control (*inordinatum*), which cannot be, for God leaves nothing uncontrolled in his kingdom. But this is determined, that even the smallest unfitness is impossible with God. *Anselm.* Tell me, then, what payment you make God for your sin? *Boso.* Repentance, a broken and contrite heart, self-denial, various bodily sufferings, pity in giving and forgiving, and obedience. *Anselm.* What do you give to God in all these? *Boso.* Do I not honor God, when, for his love and fear, in heartfelt contrition I give up worldly joy, and despire,

amid abstinence and toils, the delights and ease of this life, and submit obediently to him, freely bestowing my possessions in giving to and releasing others? *Anselm*. When you render anything to God, which you owe him, irrespective of your past sin, you should not reckon this as the debt which you owe for sin. But you owe God every one of those things you have mentioned. For, in this mortal state, there should be such love and such desire of attaining the true end of your being, which is the meaning of prayer, and such grief that you have not yet reached this object, and such fear lest you fail of it, that you should find joy in nothing, which does not help you or give encouragement of your success. For you do not deserve to have a thing which you do not love and desire for its own sake, and the want of which at present, together with the great danger of never getting it, causes you no grief. This also requires one to avoid ease and worldly pleasures, such as seduce the mind from real rest and pleasure, except so far as you think suffices for the accomplishment of that object. But you ought to view the gifts which you bestow as a part of your debt, since you know that what you give comes not from yourself, but from him whose servant both you are and he also to whom you give. And nature herself teaches you to do to your fellow servant, man to man, as you would be done by; and that he, who will not bestow what he has, ought not to receive what he has not. Of forgiveness, indeed, I speak briefly, for, as we said above, vengeance in no sense belongs to you, since you are not your own, nor is he who injures you yours or his, but you are both the servants of one Lord, made by him out of nothing. And if you avenge yourself upon your fellow servant, you proudly assume judgment over him, when it is the peculiar right of God, the judge of all. But what do you give to God by your obedience, which is not owed him already, since he demands from you all that you are and have and can become? *Boso*. Truly I dare not say that in all these things I pay any portion of my debt to God. *Anselm*. How then do you pay God for your transgression? *Boso*. If in justice I owe God myself and all my powers, even when I do not sin, I have nothing left to render to him for my sin. *Anselm*. What will become of you then? How will you be saved? *Boso*. Merely looking at your arguments, I see no way of escape. But, turning to my belief, I hope through Christian faith, "which works by love," that I may be saved, and the more, since we

read, that if the sinner turns from his iniquity and does what is right, all his transgressions shall be forgotten. *Anselm.* This is only said of those who either looked for Christ, before his coming, or who believe in him, since he has appeared. But we set aside Christ and his religion, as if they did not exist, when we proposed to inquire whether his coming were necessary to man's salvation. *Boso.* We did so. *Anselm.* Let us, then, proceed by reason simply. *Boso.* Though you bring me into straits, yet I very much wish you to proceed as you have begun.

CHAP. XXI. *How great a burden sin is.*

Anselm. Suppose that you did not owe any of those things, which you have brought up as possible payment for your sin, let us inquire whether they can satisfy for a sin so small as one *look* contrary to the will of God. *Boso.* Did I not hear you question the thing, I should suppose that a single repentant feeling on my part would blot out this sin. *Anselm.* You have not as yet estimated the great burden of sin. *Boso.* Show it me then. *Anselm.* If you should find yourself in the sight of God, and one said to you: "look thither;" and God, on the other hand, should say: "It is not my will that you should look;" ask your own heart, what there is in all existing things, which would make it right for you to give that *look* contrary to the will of God. *Boso.* I can find no motive, which would make it right; unless, indeed, I am so situated as to make it necessary for me either to do this or some greater sin. *Anselm.* Put away all such necessity; and ask with regard to this sin only, whether you can do it even for your own salvation. *Boso.* I see plainly that I cannot. *Anselm.* Not to detain you too long; what if it were necessary either that the whole universe, except God himself, should perish and fall back into nothing, or else that you should do so small a thing, against the will of God? *Boso.* When I consider the action itself, it appears very slight; but when I view it as contrary to the will of God, I know of nothing so grievous, and of no loss that will compare with it; but sometimes we oppose another's will without blame in order to preserve his property, so that afterwards he is glad that we opposed him. *Anselm.* This is in the case of man, who often does not know what is useful for him, or cannot make up his loss; but God is in want of nothing, and, should all things perish, can restore them as easily as he created them. *Boso.* I must confess that I ought not to oppose

the will of God even to preserve the whole creation. *Anselm.* What if there were more worlds as full of beings as this? *Boso.* Were they increased to an infinite extent, and held before me in like manner, my reply would be the same. *Anselm.* You cannot answer more correctly, but consider, also, should it happen, that you gave the look contrary to God's will, what payment you can make for this sin? *Boso.* I can only repeat what I said before. *Anselm.* So heinous is our sin, whenever we knowingly oppose the will of God even in the slightest thing; since we are always in his sight, and he always enjoins it upon us not to sin. *Boso.* I cannot deny it. *Anselm.* Therefore you make no satisfaction, unless you restore something greater than the amount of that obligation, which should restrain you from committing the sin. *Boso.* Reason seems to demand this, and to make the contrary wholly impossible. *Anselm.* Even God cannot raise to happiness any being bound at all by the debt of sin, because He ought not to. *Boso.* This decision is most weighty. *Anselm.* Listen to an additional reason, which makes it no less difficult for man to be reconciled to God. *Boso.* This alone would drive me to despair, were it not for the consolation of faith. *Anselm.* But listen. *Boso.* Say on.

CHAP. XXII. *What contempt man brought upon God, when he allowed himself to be conquered by the devil; for which he can make no satisfaction.*

Anselm. Man being made holy was placed in paradise, as it were in the place of God, between God and the devil, to conquer the devil by not yielding to his temptation, and so to vindicate the honor of God, and put the devil to shame, because that man, though weaker and dwelling upon earth, should not sin though tempted by the devil, while the devil, though stronger and in heaven, sinned without any to tempt him. And when man could have easily effected this, he, without compulsion and of his own accord, allowed himself to be brought over to the will of the devil, contrary to the will and honor of God. *Boso.* To what would you bring me? *Anselm.* Decide for yourself, if it be not contrary to the honor of God, for man to be reconciled to Him, with this calumnious reproach still heaped upon God; unless man first shall have honored God by overcoming the devil, as he dishonored him in yielding to the devil. Now the victory ought to be of this kind, that, as in his strength and immortal

vigor, he freely yielded to the devil to sin, and on this account justly incurred the penalty of death; so, in his weakness and mortality, which he had brought upon himself, he should conquer the devil by the pain of death, while wholly avoiding sin. But this cannot be done, so long as from the deadly effect of the first transgression, man is conceived and born in sin. *Boso.* Again I say that the thing is impossible, and reason approves what you say. *Anselm.* Let me mention one thing more, without which man's reconciliation cannot be justly effected, and the impossibility is the same. *Boso.* You have already presented so many obligations which we ought to fulfil, that nothing which you can add will alarm me more. *Anselm.* Yet listen. *Boso.* I will.

CHAP. XXIII. *What man took from God by his sin, which he has no power to repay.*

Anselm. What did man take from God, when he allowed himself to be overcome by the devil? *Boso.* Go on to mention, as you have begun, the evil things which can be added to those already shown, for I am ignorant of them. *Anselm.* Did not man take from God whatever He had purposed to do for human nature? *Boso.* There is no denying that. *Anselm.* Listen to the voice of strict justice; and judge according to that whether man makes to God a real satisfaction for his sin, unless, by overcoming the devil, man restore to God what he took from God in allowing himself to be conquered by the devil; so that, as, by this conquest over man, the devil took what belonged to God, and God was the loser, so in man's victory the devil may be despoiled, and God recover his right. *Boso.* Surely nothing can be more exactly, or justly conceived. *Anselm.* Think you that supreme justice can violate *this* justice? *Boso.* I dare not think it. *Anselm.* Therefore man cannot and ought not by any means to receive from God, what God designed to give him, unless he return to God everything which he took from him; so that, as by man God suffered loss, by man, also, He might recover His loss. But this cannot be effected except in this way: that, as in the fall of man, all human nature was corrupted, and, as it were, tainted with sin, and God will not choose one of such a race to fill up the number in his heavenly kingdom; so, by man's victory, as many men may be justified from sin as are needed to complete the number which man was made to fill. But a sinful man can by no means do this, for a sinner cannot justify a sinner.

Boso. There is nothing more just or necessary; but, from all these things, the compassion of God and the hope of man seems to fail, as far as regards that happiness for which man was made.

Anselm. Yet wait a little. *Boso.* Have you anything further?

CHAP. XXIV. *How, as long as man does not restore what he owes God, he cannot be happy, nor is he excused by want of power.*

Anselm. If a man is called unjust, who does not pay his fellow man a debt, much more is he unjust who does not restore what he owes God. *Boso.* If he can pay and yet does not, he is certainly unjust. But if he be not able, wherein is he unjust?

Anselm. Indeed, if the origin of his inability were not in himself, there might be some excuse for him. But if in this very impotence lies the fault, as it does not lessen the sin, neither does it excuse him from paying what is due. Suppose one should assign his slave a certain piece of work, and should command him not to throw himself into a ditch, which he points out to him, and from which he could not extricate himself; and suppose that the slave, despising his master's command and warning, throws himself into the ditch before pointed out, so as to be utterly unable to accomplish the work assigned; think you that his inability will at all excuse him for not doing his appointed work? *Boso.* By no means, but will rather increase his crime,

since he brought his inability upon himself. For doubly hath he sinned, in not doing what he was commanded to do, and in doing

what he was forewarned not to do. *Anselm.* Just so inexcusable is man, who has voluntarily brought upon himself a debt which he cannot pay, and by his own fault disabled himself, so that he can neither escape his previous obligation not to sin, nor pay the debt which he has incurred by sin. For his very inability is guilt, because he ought not to have it; nay, he ought to be free from it; for as it is a crime not to have what he ought, it is also a crime to have what he ought not. Therefore, as it is a crime in man not to have that power which he received to avoid sin, it is also a crime to have that inability by which he can neither do right and avoid sin, nor restore the debt which he owes on account of his sin. For it is by his own free action that he loses that power, and falls into this inability. For not to have the power which one ought to have, is the same thing as to have the inability which one ought not to have. Therefore man's inability to restore what he owes to God, an inability brought

upon himself for that very purpose, does not excuse man from paying; for the result of sin cannot excuse the sin itself. *Boso.* This argument is exceedingly weighty, and must be true. *Anselm.* Man, then, is unjust in not paying what he owes to God. *Boso.* This is very true; for he is unjust both in not paying, and in not being able to pay. *Anselm.* But no unjust person shall be admitted to happiness; for, as that happiness is complete in which there is nothing wanting, so it can belong to no one who is not so pure as to have no injustice found in him. *Boso.* I dare not think otherwise. *Anselm.* He, then, who does not pay God what he owes, can never be happy. *Boso.* I cannot deny that this is so. *Anselm.* But if you choose to say that a merciful God remits to the suppliant his debt, because he cannot pay; God must be said to dispense with one of two things, viz. either this, which man ought voluntarily to render, but cannot, that is, an equivalent for his sin, a thing which ought not to be given up even to save the whole universe besides God; or else this, which, as I have before said, God was about to take away from man by punishment, even against man's will, viz. happiness. But, if God gives up what man ought freely to render, for the reason that man cannot repay it, what is this but saying that God gives up what he is unable to obtain? But it is mockery to ascribe such compassion to God. But if God gives up what he was about to take from unwilling man, because man is unable to restore what he ought to restore freely, He abates the punishment, and makes man happy on account of his sin, because he has what he ought not to have. For he ought not to have this inability, and therefore as long as he has it without atonement, it is his sin. And truly such compassion on the part of God is wholly contrary to the Divine justice, which allows nothing but punishment as the recompense of sin. Therefore, as God cannot be inconsistent with himself, his compassion cannot be of this nature. *Boso.* I think, then, we must look for another mercy than this. *Anselm.* But suppose it were true that God pardons the man who does not pay his debt, because he cannot. *Boso.* I could wish it were so. *Anselm.* But while man does not make payment, he either wishes to restore, or else he does not wish to. Now if he wishes to do what he cannot, he will be needy, and if he does not wish to, he will be unjust. *Boso.* Nothing can be plainer. *Anselm.* But whether needy or unjust, he will not be happy. *Boso.* This also is plain. *Anselm.* So long, then, as he

does not restore, he will not be happy. *Boso.* If God follows the method of justice, there is no escape for the miserable wretch, and God's compassion seems to fail. *Anselm.* You have demanded an explanation; now hear it. I do not deny that God is merciful, who preserveth man and beast, according to the multitude of his mercies. But we are speaking of that exceeding pity, by which he makes man happy after this life. And I think that I have amply proved, by the reasons given above, that happiness ought not to be bestowed upon any one whose sins have not been wholly put away; and that this remission ought not to take place, save by the payment of the debt incurred by sin, according to the extent of sin. And if you think that any objections can be brought against these proofs, you ought to mention them. *Boso.* I see not how your reasons can be at all invalidated. *Anselm.* Nor do I, if rightly understood. But even if one of the whole number be confirmed by impregnable truth, that should be sufficient. For truth is equally secured against all doubt, if it be demonstrably proved by one argument, as by many. *Boso.* Surely this is so. But how, then, shall man be saved, if he neither pays what he owes, and ought not to be saved, without paying? Or, with what face shall we declare that God, who is rich in mercy above human conception, cannot exercise this compassion? *Anselm.* This is the question which you ought to ask of those, in whose behalf you are speaking, who have no faith in the need of Christ for man's salvation, and you should also request them to tell how man can be saved without Christ. But, if they are utterly unable to do it, let them cease from mocking us, and let them hasten to unite themselves with us, who do not doubt that man can be saved through Christ; else let them despair of being saved at all. And if this terrifies them, let them believe in Christ as we do, that they may be saved. *Boso.* Let me ask you, as I have begun, to show me how a man is saved by Christ.

CI AP. XXV. *How man's salvation by Christ is necessarily possible.*

Anselm. Is it not sufficiently proved that man can be saved by Christ, when even infidels do not deny that man can be happy somehow, and it has been sufficiently shown, that, leaving Christ out of view, no salvation can be found for man? For, either by Christ, or by some one else, can man be saved, or else

not at all. If, then, it is false that man cannot be saved at all, or that he can be saved in any other way, his salvation must necessarily be by Christ. *Boso.* But what reply will you make to a person who perceives that man cannot be saved in any other way, and yet, not understanding how he can be saved by Christ, sees fit to declare that there cannot be any salvation either by Christ or in any other way? *Anselm.* What reply ought to be made to one who ascribes impossibility to a necessary truth, because he does not understand how it can be? *Boso.* That he is a fool. *Anselm.* Then what he says must be despised. *Boso.* Very true; but we ought to show him in what way the thing is true, which he holds to be impossible. *Anselm.* Do you not perceive, from what we have said above, that it is necessary for some men to attain to felicity? For, if it is unfitting for God to elevate man with any stain upon him, to that for which he made him free from all stain, lest it should seem that God had repented of his good intent, or was unable to accomplish his designs; far more is it impossible, on account of the same unfitness, that no man should be exalted to that state for which he was made. Therefore, a satisfaction, such as we have above proved necessary, for sin, must be found apart from the Christian faith, which no reason can show; or else we must accept the Christian doctrine. For what is clearly made out by absolute reasoning, ought by no means to be questioned, even though the method of it be not understood. *Boso.* What you say is true. *Anselm.* Why, then, do you question further? *Boso.* I come not for this purpose, to have you remove doubts from my faith, but to have you show me the reason of my confidence. Therefore, as you have brought me thus far by your reasoning, so that I perceive that man as a sinner owes God for his sin, what he is unable to pay, and cannot be saved without paying; I wish you would go further with me, and enable me to understand, by force of reasoning, the fitness of all those things which the Catholic faith enjoins upon us with regard to Christ, if we hope to be saved; and how they avail for the salvation of man, and how God saves man by compassion; when he never remits his sin, unless man shall have rendered what was due on account of his sin. And, to make your reasoning the clearer, begin at the beginning, so as to rest it upon a strong foundation. *Anselm.* Now God help me, for you do not spare me in the least, nor consider the weakness of my skill, when you enjoin so great a work upon me.

Yet I will attempt it, as I have begun, not trusting in myself but in God, and will do what I can with his help. But let us separate the things which remain to be said from those which have been said, by a new introduction, lest by their unbroken length, these things become tedious to one who wishes to read them.

[End of Book First. To be concluded.]

ARTICLE IV.

SPECIAL DIVINE INTERPOSITIONS IN NATURE.¹

By Edward Hitchcock, D. D., LL. D., Amherst College.

No subject of theology has in it more true moral sublimity than the government of God over this world. Yet it is eminently a practical subject. Our views of it afford a test of our piety and a type of its character. Nay, there is one feature of this government, that has been regarded as the chief distinction between revealed and natural religion. We refer to *Special Divine Interpositions*. These have been supposed to be peculiar to revelation; while nature moves on by uniform, unchanging and unchangeable laws; nor does the whole history of those laws, as given by natural science, show a single example of interference or modification on the part of the Deity.

We venture to call in question the correctness of these views. If we have read nature aright, it teaches a different lesson. That lesson may be worth learning. We choose for our subject, therefore, *SPECIAL DIVINE INTERPOSITIONS IN NATURE, as made known by science.*

Let us, in the first place, endeavor to affix a definite meaning to the phrase: *Special Divine Interpositions.*

But here, perhaps, it may be necessary to interpose a remark, to prevent misunderstanding. We assume, as the basis of much

¹ This paper, essentially as here given, was delivered at the Anniversaries of the Newton and Bangor Theological Seminaries.

of our reasoning, those views, now almost universal among geologists, and very common among theologians, which teach that this world existed through a vast and indefinite period before man was placed upon it. Such an opinion we think perfectly reconcilable with a fair interpretation of Scripture; though this is not the place to go into the proof. But let no one imagine, when we take such views for granted, that we mean to cast the slightest doubt upon the inspiration and literal truth of revelation. Let us be believed rather, when we express the conviction, that, if admitted, they afford a strong corroboration and illustration of some most important doctrines of revelation.

We proceed now to affix a definite meaning to the phrase :
Special Divine Interpositions.

It requires but a few years' experience in this world, to satisfy any observing mind, that natural operations are carried on in a settled order; that the same causes, in the same circumstances, are invariably followed by the same effects. We call this uniformity of operation, the course of nature; and the invariable connection between antecedent and consequent, we call the laws of nature. If we should see a new force coming in to disturb this settled order, we should call it a miracle. It might do this by a direct counteraction of nature's laws; and this is the common idea of a miracle. But if an unwonted force were added to those laws, the result would be a miracle; and so would a diminution or suspension of these actions; for in either case the effect would be out of the ordinary course of nature, and this we take to be the essential idea in a miracle. Perhaps the best and briefest definition of a miracle, is, an event that cannot be explained by the laws of nature. It may, and usually does, contravene those laws; but it may show only that their force has been increased or diminished.

This, then, is one example of special Divine interposition. Is there any other? Most writers, theologians as well as others, would probably answer in the negative. For they admit only two classes of events in the universe, the miraculous and the ordinary; the supernatural and the natural. And yet most of them maintain that God exercises over the world a special providence. It is, indeed, true that very wide differences exist as to the meaning of this phrase. One theologian tells us that the providence of God "over the human family is termed special;" and that "over those persons who are distinguished for virtue

and piety, is called most special."¹ Another calls that providence special "which relates to the church."² Another regards providence "special when it relates to moral beings, to men and human affairs."³

But whatever may be the views of this phrase among technical theologians, the leading idea attached to it among Christians generally, is, that God provides and arranges the circumstances in which men are placed, so as to meet the exigencies of individuals, just as he would have them met, and so as will be best for them. In other words, he provides means exactly adapted to meet the specific wants of individuals.

Now it is an interesting inquiry, whether this can be accomplished by the ordinary and unmodified operation of the laws of nature. We confess ourselves unable to conceive of but two modes in which it can be done.

It is not difficult to imagine how God, at the beginning, when he established the laws of nature, did so arrange their operation as to bring about such results as the exigencies of every individual would demand, and at the exact moment desired. Human intellect is, indeed, confounded when it attempts to conceive of a foresight so vast as to embrace in a glance the history of every individual of the race, and then so to arrange the countless agencies of nature, that every item in the history of the numberless millions of our race should be as carefully and exactly provided for, as if only one individual were concerned. But we are certain that all this is perfectly easy to Infinite Intelligence. To suppose the contrary, is to destroy the idea of omniscience; and, therefore, we are bound to believe what we cannot comprehend.

It will help us to conceive how God might thus arrange and adapt the laws of the universe to meet particular exigencies, if we consider how it is that most events are brought about in our experience. We are apt to regard them as dependent upon a single second cause, or, at most, upon a few causes, just because one or two are the immediate antecedents. But how few events are there, that have not been essentially modified, at least as to the time and manner of their occurrence and in intensity, by what may be called lateral influences. We see a given cause operating, and we are apt to feel that we know what will be its ultimate effect. But we forget that every event in the universe

¹ Storr and Platt's Biblical Theology, p. 240.

² Buck's Theological Dictionary.

³ Knapp's Theology, Vol. I. p. 501.

has a connection with all other events; that, in fact, the whole series of causes in the universe constitutes a plexus, or net-work, in which, if you remove one of the fibres, you remove the whole. Every occurrence is, indeed, dependent mainly upon a leading cause; but the result may, after all, be prevented, or greatly modified, by any other cause. So that, as Bishop Butler remarks: "any one thing whatever, may, for aught we know to the contrary, be a necessary condition to any other."¹

Conceive of a vast hollow sphere, in which balls of various sizes are moving in every direction, and with all degrees of velocity. Fixing your eye upon a single ball, you see it moving towards a given point, and, if it meet with no obstruction, you are sure that point will be reached. It may pass through its whole course untouched. But when your eyes are opened to discern the countless multitude of other balls flying through the same sphere, you feel almost sure that it will be deflected from its course, and its motion accelerated or retarded, by a multitude of collisions; nor can you predict, by any mathematics which the human mind can master, what will be the exact course of that single ball. But how easy for God to do it; and how easy for Him so to place the other balls and to give them such momentum, as will carry the single one to a given point at a given time.

Now this supposition gives us a not unapt representation of the manner in which the events of the world of matter and of mind are brought about. They are almost never the result of a single secondary cause, acting directly and simply, but of a great multitude of causes, modifying one another, and conspiring to bring out the final development. All these agencies were originally ordained and arranged by the Deity, in the manner that seemed best to infinite wisdom, which had infinite power at command. Can it be, that they were put into operation without any plan, or with only a general object in view? Who does not see that God might, at the beginning, have given to these countless forces such degrees of strength and such adjustment and direction, that they would bring about just such results in the history of every individual as would be desirable? Thus would every case of special providence be met as certainly as if He should interfere miraculously at the moment in each man's life when special interposition would be desirable.

¹ Analogy, Part I. Chap. VII.

But with such a complex system of second causes in operation, it is easy to see how the same object could be accomplished by such a modification of some of those causes by the Deity, at any given moment, as would produce the desired result. And this might be done out of human view, so that man would see only the ordinary operation of nature's laws, and, therefore, there would be no miracle; for any event that can be explained by the regular operation of nature's laws, as already remarked, is not a miracle.

To most men these two modes of providing for special providences: the one by a disposition of the laws of nature in the Divine mind from eternity, the other by some change effected at the moment by Divine interference in the complex causes of events; we say these two modes will seem to most persons very unlike. Indeed, they cannot see how there should be anything special in an event that was provided for in the counsels of eternity, and which transpires as the result of arrangements then made. In order to make it special, they feel as if it were necessary that the Deity should interpose, in some way or other, at the time of its occurrence, just as the mechanic finds it necessary to modify his machine, if he wishes to accomplish some specific object not provided for by its regular operation.

Now we feel confident that such impressions result from our limited views; or rather from the difficulty which finite creatures experience in understanding the mode in which an Infinite Being thinks and acts. It is hard to divest ourselves of the idea that, in his processes of thought and action, God is altogether such an one as ourselves. But there are certain principles, true of the Divine mind and Divine action, that cannot enter at all into human powers and human conduct. One is, that no new plan or motive of action can ever enter the Divine mind, and consequently whatever plans we find developed in God's government, must have been perfectly formed in the counsels of eternity. Another principle is, that God never acts except under the guidance of those fixed principles which we call law. Hence miracles are brought about by fixed laws as much as common events; that is, in the same circumstances we may expect the same miracle. The law of miracles does, indeed, differ from all others, and this constitutes a miracle. But to suppose that God ever acts without the guidance of a settled principle, is to impute to him a want of wisdom and character, which we should be

slow to charge upon an eminent man. No less absurd is it, to suppose the Deity ever to act by the impulse of after thoughts, as men do; or that he ever does anything which he had not, eternal ages since, resolved to do, in manner and time exactly as it takes place.

If these are correct positions, what possible difference can it make, whether we suppose God to have arranged the agencies of nature at the beginning, so as to meet every exigency, or to interpose, whenever necessary, to accomplish specific purposes by some new force or law? Why is not the one as special as the other? If he did in eternity arrange and balance the forces of nature in a particular manner, with the express design of meeting a particular exigency, what matter how many ages intervene between the arrangement and the event? If a miracle was needed at a particular moment of human history, and God originally so arranged the universe that the law of miracles should come in just at the right moment, would the event be any the less special than if we suppose he stood by at the moment, like a finite being, and by his power arrested or counteracted the laws of nature? And the same is true of the means by which a special providence is brought about. An eternal provision made for it, shows merely the perfection of the Divine plans and operations, but takes nothing from its speciality.

A question may arise in some minds, whether such views do not make all events special, though such a statement be a solecism. For if God has arranged the agencies of his natural and moral government so that all events happen, just as He intended, on what ground is it proper to say that one of them is more special than another? Do they not all meet some particular exigency? and what more can any of them do?

The fallacy of such an objection lies in the assumption that all events are equally the objects of God's intention. If it were proper to apply such a term to God, we might say that there is such a thing as an *incidental* providence, that is, an event which transpires as the necessary result of a certain arrangement, but which was not the specific object of such arrangement. Perhaps our meaning may be made obvious by reference to an illustration already employed.

We refer to the supposition of a vast hollow sphere with balls flying through it in all directions, and of course often interfering with one another. Take a particular ball, and admit that God

has so adjusted its direction and velocity, that, in spite of collisions, it shall reach a given spot at a stated time. Suppose that thus to reach the point, is the grand object God has in view in setting the ball in motion. Yet on its way to that point, it might encounter a multitude of other balls, and each collision would constitute events as distinct and as certainly foreseen and determined upon as the final one. But they might not accomplish any specific object, and be merely incidental to such a system of moving bodies. God might, indeed, in infinite wisdom make them subservient to other objects besides the ultimate one; but they might be mere incidental occurrences in such a system, which even Omnipotence could not prevent without altering the system.

Now have we not two classes of events, equally the result of Divine power and wisdom? yet one of them is special and accomplishes a definite object, the other is merely incidental, and may or may not be used for a special purpose. Just so can we see how the special providence of God may be distinct from common providence, although both are equally the work of God. He has so arranged the agencies of his government, that certain specific objects shall be accomplished infallibly. But through the operation of those agencies, a multitude of other events are brought about incidentally, which, although related to special providences, are not such in themselves.

Another inquiry may arise in reference to some of the preceding reasoning. We have endeavored to show that special providences may be the result of an original adjustment of the agencies of the natural and moral world, or of direct interposition by the Deity out of sight in modifying those agencies. Now the question is, which of these methods is actually employed in the Divine government? Can we determine which? If by special interposition at the moment, is not the evidence of such interposition precluded by the very supposition we have made? For the statement is, that the interposition must be made out of our sight; while within view, the event seems to be brought about by the ordinary laws of nature, since, if made within sight, it would be miraculous. All we can prove, therefore, is, that God can thus interpose and modify events within sight, by altering their antecedents out of sight, and this is all that seems necessary for the purposes of religion. Hence it is that the Scriptures never raise any such questions as this, but simply and boldly

assert the agency of God in the leading events in the history of nations, communities and individuals.

From the preceding course of reasoning, we think we may consider the following positions as established :

First, that there are two modes in which Divine interposition may take place ; the one by miracles, and the other by special providences.

By a miraculous providence, we mean, such a superintendence over the world, as interferes, when desirable, with the regular operations of nature within the sphere of human vision, and brings about events, either in opposition to natural laws, or by giving them a greater or less power, than in their normal state.

By a special providence, we mean, an event brought about apparently by natural laws, yet, in fact, the result of some special agency on the part of the Deity, either by an original arrangement of natural laws, or the subsequent modification of second causes which lie beyond man's sphere of vision.

Secondly, that both these modes of interposition take place in accordance with fixed laws, or rules of action, so that there is a law of miracles and of special providence as well as of common phenomena.

Thirdly, that the difference between miracles and special providence lies in this, that the former cannot, and the latter can, be explained by the laws of nature.

Fourthly, that special providences may be the result of an original arrangement of the laws of the natural and moral world, such as to produce special results, or of a direct modification of those laws at any time by Divine power, in some of the links of causation out of sight.

And, finally, that the events are equally special, whether the result of an original ordination in the Divine mind, or of direct modification of natural agencies at the time of their occurrence ; nor can we, from the nature of the case, prove in which mode, or whether by both modes, Divine wisdom acts.

The main question now returns upon us, whether there is any evidence of special Divine interposition in nature, save those which revelation has recorded ? All such interpositions must, indeed, occur in natural operations, since it is their suspension or modification that constitutes the interposition ; but the inquiry is, does science, or common history, apart from revelation, contain any such records ?

We waive the inquiry at the present time as to the evidence which uninspired civil history may contain of special interposition, both because the field is too wide for the limits of this Article, and has already been to a considerable extent explored. But the records of physical science have not hitherto, to our knowledge, yielded much of this kind of fruit. Our object at this time is to attempt to gather at least one cluster from that field.

It must be confessed, that, as a general fact, physical science seems barren of any evidence of special Divine interference; presenting us, instead, with operations as uniform and unchanging as mathematical laws can make them. Nevertheless, if we do not greatly mistake, on some portions of the vast field we can discover the imprints of special and miraculous providence.

We shall speak first of special providence; but only in a brief manner.

From the nature of the case it might be presumed, that we should need a revelation to show that God had originally arranged, or directly modified, natural agencies so as to meet exigencies in the case^s of individuals or communities. For as man sees it, such providence seems to be brought about by unmodified natural operations. It is hardly sufficient to prove special providence, to find that great wisdom is shown in contriving and adjusting the laws and agencies of nature, so as to meet the necessities of the animate creation. We want the proof that those laws and agencies have been so arranged and modified as to meet particular exigencies, and with those exigencies specially present in the Divine mind. For all the purposes of religious faith, it is sufficient to show that God can do this; and, therefore, we need not expect that nature will offer many examples which clearly show it to have been done. But believers in special providence suppose that they can find proof, in their own experience, or that of others, that God has thus interposed, either to bless or punish them. When they perceive that various causes have conspired — causes, it may be, both remote and undesirable — to bring about a certain result, they call it a special providence. We know that we need to be slow and cautious in drawing such inferences; but not unfrequently the evidence is so clear and decided, that not to do it would be hurtful scepticism. We will mention one or two analogous cases in nature.

It is no longer a conjecture, but a settled fact, that our globe has been the seat of several distinct economies of animal and vegetable life; that whole races, if not over the whole globe at once, yet over wide districts, have become extinct, and been succeeded by new families, and the new species have been quite different from the old, requiring new conditions as to location, climate and food. Now in every instance yet known to us, the new races have been met by conditions exactly adapted to their wants. And this has taken place, although the state of the globe has been one of slow but constant flux, both from the escape of its internal heat, the vertical movements of continents, and the action of volcanos and water. When we consider how delicate a balancing of these and a multitude of other agencies would be requisite to accomplish such an object; how many causes must have been adjusted and made to converge to a given point through a long series of ages, it does seem to us that this case should be regarded as something beyond a mere wise and benevolent ordination of nature's laws, and as a special adaptation, foreseen and provided for by the Deity, either by an original adjustment of natural laws, or by their subsequent modification, so as to bring the case fairly within the definition of a special providence. If any think that by thus regarding a case of this kind we should include all examples of wise adaptation as special providences, we can only say, that there certainly is a difference that should be recognized, between cases of this sort, which seem to have been the special object of Divine wisdom and intention, and those incidental events which result from the adjustments necessary to bring about the special events.

But the records of science furnish us with another class of examples in nature, still more indicative of a special providence. They are cases in which complicated causes have operated through vast periods of duration, anterior to man's existence, or even anterior to that of scarcely any of the more perfect animals, in order to provide for the wants and happiness of those animals, especially of man. Laws apparently conflicting and irregular in their action, have been so controlled and directed and made to conspire, as to provide for the wants of civilized life, untold ages before man's existence. In those early times, vast forests, for instance, might have been seen, growing along the shores of estuaries, and these dying, were buried deep in the mud, there to accumulate thick beds of vegetable matter, over large areas,

and this, by a long series of changes, was at length converted into coal. This could be of no use whatever till man's existence, nor even then, till civilization had taught him how to employ this substance for his comfort, and for a great variety of useful arts. Look, for instance, at the small island of Great Britain. At this day 15,000 steam engines are driven by means of coal, with a power equal to that of 2,000,000 of men; and thus is put into operation, machinery equalling the unaided power of 300,000,000 or 400,000,000 of men. The influence thence emanating reaches the remotest portions of the globe, and tends mightily to the civilization and happiness of the race. And is all this an accidental effect of nature's laws? Is it not rather a striking example of special prospective providence? What else but Divine power, intent upon a specific purpose, could have so directed the countless agencies employed, through so many ages, as to bring about such marvellous results?

Or take an example on a still more gigantic scale. It is already ascertained that, by the same process of vegetable growth and decay in the hoary past, thick beds of coal have been accumulated in the rocks of the United States, over an area of more than 20,000 square miles, and probably many more remain to be discovered. Yet, upon a moderate calculation, those already known contain more than 1,100,000 cubic miles of coal; one mile of which, at the rate it is now used, would furnish the country with coal for a thousand years; so that a million of years will not exhaust our supply. What an incalculable increase of the use of steam, and a consequent increase of population and general prosperity, does such a treasure of fuel open before this country! If our numbers should become only as many to the square mile as in Great Britain, or 223, there is room enough, this side of the Rocky Mountains, for 500,000,000; and, including the western slope of those mountains, for 700,000,000; equal almost to the present population of the globe. And yet all that has been thus seen in this country, and all that is in prospect, is only an accidental, or incidental, event in his theology, who admits no special providence in nature. We are not of that number; for we not only believe that God, through vast cycles of duration, directed and controlled the agencies of nature, so as to bury, in the bosom of this continent, the means of future civilization and prosperity, but that a strong obligation hence results for every one living here, to throw all his energies

into the work of making this land a glory and a blessing to the nations.

Let us go once more, on the wings of imagination, back to that remote period of our world's history, when most of its present continents were beneath the ocean. As we hover over the waters, we see them agitated by internal forces, and now and then smoke and ashes, and it may be flames, issue from their surface. Submarine volcanoes are pouring forth their contents; and could we look beneath the troubled waves, we should probably see beds of various kinds, thrown out by the volcano, spreading themselves along the bottom. Among these beds we should probably see gypsum and common salt. But what has this to do with special providence? Let the ages roll on and we shall see. By and by that ocean's bed is slowly lifted above the waves. Those waves, daring its emergence, cover it with a soil adapted to vegetation. Man at length fixes his dwelling upon it. He discovers, among the exposed strata, the gypsum and salt which he so greatly needs, and which by ingenuity and industry he can extract. And thereby can he greatly multiply his comforts and his numbers.

In like manner, might we go back and trace out the origin of the various ores, the marbles, the granites, the porphyries, and other mineral treasures so important to an advanced state of the arts, and of civilization and happiness. And we should find them originating in agencies equally remote, equally chaotic and irregular, and seemingly as much removed from all connection with man's long subsequent appearance. But it does seem to us that, during the long series of preparatory agencies, we can everywhere see the finger of God's special providence, pointing to the final result.

But we turn now to inquire, in the second place, what evidence we have, in the records of science, of God's miraculous providence? And we take the position that, in the natural history of our globe, we meet with phenomena explicable only by miraculous intervention.

Not to speak of the earliest condition of the world, which hypothesis alone can describe, let us follow back its history only to the time when legitimate theory shows it to have been in a molten state. That its internal parts are still in that condition, and that its now solid crust was once so, seem to us to be proved by fair inference from facts; and such is the opinion of almost all

scientific men. Think of it now in that condition; a shoreless ocean of fire. It is not difficult to conceive how, by the radiation of its heat, a solid crust should form, and at length the water condense upon its surface, while volcanic force should form such inequalities as would make beds for the oceans, and elevations for continents. Nay, by the action of the waves and the atmosphere, soils might be accumulated upon the surface. But, in spite of all that merely natural operations could do, what a scene of utter desolation and loneliness would it present! That wonderful power, which we call life, and the still more mysterious principle of mind, would be absent. How then were the numberless forms of organism, animal and vegetable, possessed of life and instinct, and some of them with powers of intellect, how were these introduced? If miraculous interposition be not necessary here, we know of no exigency in which it can be; and we may as well dismiss the idea from our philosophy and our theology. Just see what the problem is: nothing less than to take a world of rock, more or less comminuted by water, and to convert it into essentially such a world as the present; to take a world utterly dead and desolate, and spread through its atmosphere, its waters, and its solid surface, ten thousand forms of life and beauty. Has nature any hidden inherent power to do all this? Why, then, can we not lay our finger upon a single manifestation of creative power in nature in these latter times? On that power is the prerogative of the Deity alone. Who shall have the boldness and even the impiety to transfer to blind, unintelligent law, what demands infinite intelligence and infinite power, miraculously exerted?

And yet there have always been men who have done this; not, indeed, in the bold language in which we have stated the principle. Yet some of them have confessed that their object was to sustain atheism. Others have said merely that they meant to show that everything, even the creation of animals and plants, was accomplished through the inherent self-creating power of law, but they left the origin of the laws to each one's own convictions. Nay, some have attempted to reconcile this creation by law, not merely with theism, but with a belief in revelation. This is the form in which this hypothesis has clothed itself in our own day. In such a dress it has ventured forth from the philosopher's study, where it has so long been isolated, and become incorporated with the fashionable literature

of the day. And it has enough of plausibility about it to make it popular with men, who have only a general, but not a minute acquaintance with science, and who, afraid to live without some religious system, are yet unwilling to adopt one that brings God near. This is not the place to discuss such views. We will only say, that true philosophy must reject this hypothesis, first, because the facts adduced to sustain it, when scrutinized, are too few; and, secondly, because for every fact seemingly in its favor, a thousand testify against it. Accordingly, all the great living and recently deceased masters of physical science reject it. Does it appeal to anatomy and physiology? Cuvier, Owen and Carpenter cry out against it. Does it evoke the aid of chemistry? Berzelius, Turner and Liebig see its shallowness. Does it call on zoology for aid? Agassiz and Ehrenberg can refute its claims. Does it search the archives of geology for support? Sedgwick, Miller, Lyell and D'Orbigny can show how certainly they will fail there. Or, finally, does it appeal to botany? Hooker and Lindley, Torrey and Gray, know that it will certainly glean nothing to sustain it on that flowery field. The fact is, it is only here and there that a second rate naturalist will sympathize at all with such dreamy views.

But there is another and, perhaps, a more plausible mode of evading the general argument for the miraculous introduction of organic life upon our globe. When we descend into the rocks a certain distance, say six or eight miles, we reach those that contain no remains of animals or plants, and show the metamorphic action of heat, by which they have been partially or wholly melted. Now most geologists consider this horizon as the starting place of life on our globe, and that the rocks below it were formed before the existence of animals or plants. But some, and they eminent geologists, maintain that these lower rocks did once contain organic remains, which have been obliterated by the influence of the intense heat, and that, therefore, we cannot tell when life first appeared on the globe. For aught we know, these metamorphisms may have been going on forever.

On the other hand, it is said, that, admitting extensive metamorphic action in the lower rocks, and this is admitted by all, it seems hardly probable that every trace of organic existence should be obliterated by a heat not powerful enough to destroy the marks of stratification and lamination which still remain.

But such subjects would lead us into discussions too prolix for the present essay. We will, therefore, only say, that even if we admit that the apparent is not the real horizon of life in the rocks, there is one scientific fact that proves it did once begin, however far back we may suppose these metamorphic cycles to have extended. In other words, we can prove that there was a time when life did not exist on this globe, and consequently a time when it was first introduced. And this is the argument:

If any body, such as the earth, having a certain temperature, be surrounded by a medium, or by other bodies, with a lower temperature, it is certain, from the laws of heat, that the warmer body will continue to give off its heat to the colder ones, till at length they will be brought to the same temperature; unless the higher temperature of the central body, is maintained by the perpetual generation of heat within itself. Now we know that at present the earth is placed in exactly this condition; for it can be proved that the temperature of the sphere surrounding it, is at least fifty-eight degrees below zero. Consequently heat must be continually given off into the planetary spaces, and, unless there be some internal source of heat, the earth must be growing colder. When did this cooling process commence? Those who believe an indefinite series of organic beings to have existed on the globe, will not surely fix a beginning, because that would be yielding the main point in their hypothesis. Yet it is certain that, if the earth has been cooling for an indefinite period, the time must have been when its surface was too hot for animals and plants to live upon it; nay, when it was in a melted state. There must have been a time, therefore, when the first animals and plants were commanded into existence by the miraculous fiat of Jehovah. For the idea that the earth possesses within itself a power for the indefinite renewal of its heat as it escapes, finds no support in philosophy. We can conceive how heat might be produced while combustible substances were burning; but we know of no possible way by which an indefinite supply could be evolved.

We are unable to conceive how any philosophic mind can escape the force of such reasoning as this, which natural theology brings forward to prove a period in the history of this world, when it was destitute of organic races. But this is not the only argument which science can offer to prove miraculous interposition in nature. A second proof, quite independent of the first,

is found in the fact that the earth has been the seat of several nearly independent systems of life, since animals and plants were first introduced. A certain group, wisely adapted to one another, and to the state of the air, the waters, and the surface, as well as to the food and the temperature, have flourished for a long period; and, as some of these circumstances have changed, they have either gradually died out, or have been simultaneously destroyed by some catastrophe; so that few if any species have survived. Afterwards new races have been introduced, exactly fitted to the altered condition of things. These also, after flourishing long, have disappeared and another and another system has succeeded, until we can distinctly trace five economies previous to the existing races. Many writers say that the number of systems has been much greater; and, were we to limit our views to portions of the earth, it is undoubtedly true. But we can show that all the races, animal and vegetable, have been changed at least five times, over the whole globe; and five such changes are as good for the argument as five hundred. For though we can see how, by natural operations, organic beings can be destroyed, yet what but infinite wisdom and power can repopulate the lifeless waste? This question we have considered under our first argument, and hope we have shown that nothing but miraculous power could have done it.

But there are some peculiarities that attended the introduction of successive races, which deserve notice. From the nature of the case, the world must have been preparing, by the reduction of its temperature and increased productiveness of its soil, for a greater variety of organic beings, and for those of more delicate and perfect organization. And we find that, at the successive epochs of creation, there was a correspondent increase of the higher races, "a gradual ascent towards a higher type of being,"¹ in connection with "a gradual improvement in the style and character of the dwelling place of organized beings."² This is called the *doctrine of progression*, and it obviously points to a beginning, not only of organic races, but of the present system of inorganic nature, as well as to miraculous Divine interposition.

It is well known, however, that at least one distinguished geologist takes opposite views of this subject, and maintains

¹ Sedgwick.² Hugh Miller.

"that the existing causes of change in the animate and inanimate world may be similar not only in kind, but in degree, to those which have prevailed during many successive modifications of the earth's crust." This is called the doctrine of *uniformity*, or *non-progression*. It is not intended by its able advocate to teach the world's eternity, although it has that aspect; nor does it conflict with the idea of miraculous intervention in the creation of animals and plants; for it admits that "the succession of living beings has been continued, not by the transmutation of species, but by the introduction into the earth, from time to time, of new plants and animals; and that each assemblage of new species must have been admirably fitted for the new states of the globe as they arose, or they would not have increased and multiplied and endured for indefinite periods."¹

Even the doctrine of non-progression, then, is consistent with miraculous interpositions in nature. Much more does the doctrine of progression demand it. And we confess ourselves compelled to subscribe to the latter doctrine. So far as inorganic nature is concerned, we have already assigned a reason for this opinion. Perhaps the evidence from organic nature is not as strong, because we cannot say certainly how many of the more perfect animals will yet be discovered in the older rocks. But so far as we do know, the progression has been very decided. More than 24,000 species of animals have been dug out of the rocks; 700 of which are mammalia or quadrupeds. But 696 of these occur within 2000 or 3000 feet of the surface, while in all the 54,000 feet below, only five species have been found. Birds, the next less perfect class of animals, are scarcely more abundant in these lower rocks. Reptiles are more numerous, and extend to a greater depth, while the fishes, the least perfect of all, are still more abundant, and are found nearly at the bottom of the series. And the same increase of numbers would be found, were we to descend still lower on the scale of animals. All this accords with the doctrine of progression, and so do the facts respecting plants. Now, making the largest allowance for future discoveries, it seems hardly possible that it will ever appear, that as large a proportion of the higher orders of animals and plants existed in the earlier periods of our globe as at present.

But we hasten to offer one more proof of God's miraculous interposition furnished by the records of science. It is the crea-

¹ Lyell's *Manual of Elementary Geology*, p. 501.

tion of man. All observation teaches us that he was one of the last of the animals that was placed upon the earth. In vain do we search through the six miles of solid rocks that lie piled upon one another, commencing with the lowest, for any trace of man. And it is not till we come into the uppermost formation, we mean the alluvial, nay, not till we get almost to the top of that, merely in the loose soil that is spread over the surface, that we find his bones. And yet these, formed of the same materials as the bones of other animals, would have been as certainly preserved as theirs in the lower rocks, had he existed there. The conclusion is irresistible, and it is acquiesced in by all experienced geologists, that man did not exist as a contemporary of the animals found in the rocks. At least five vast periods of time, with their numerous yet distinct groups of organic beings, passed over this globe before the appearance of man. This is not a dreamy hypothetical conclusion, but a simple matter of fact, which has been scrutinized with great care, and by some unfriendly to revelation, who would gladly have found it otherwise. But no fossil man or works of man have been discovered below alluvium (in which we include drift); nor would any really scientific man risk his reputation by maintaining the existence of the human species earlier than the alluvial period.

What an astonishing exhibition does this scientific fact bring before us! Suppose we could explain by chemical and organic laws how the inferior animals were gradually developed from one another in the successive periods of our world's history. Yet here we have the phenomenon of a being introduced at once, superior somewhat in organic structure to the other animals, but raised immeasurably above them all, by his lofty intellectual and moral powers; a being destined to take the supreme control of all inferior natures, and, so far as need be, to subject them all to his will; and in fact to convert the elements into servants to do his pleasure. The anatomist can, indeed, describe his organization; the physiologist can point out the functions of his organs; and the zoologist can assign him his rank at the head of animate creation; but how is the psychologist baffled, when he attempts to unravel the wonders of his spiritual powers, and the theologian, when he looks into the depths of his moral and immortal nature! And did it demand no miracle to bring such a being upon the stage, and fit him exactly to his condition? What greater miracle does even revelation disclose? Admit, if you

choose, that all other events on the globe, even the creation of all other organic beings, might have been accomplished by ordinary laws ; yet, so long as the great fact of man's creation stands out so conspicuously on our world's history, we need nothing more to establish, beyond cavil, the reality of Divine interposition in nature. God has impressed his own signet so deeply upon this last act of creation, that scepticism dare not directly attempt to deface it. And this grandest miracle of nature is also the greatest of revelation. It stands up a lofty and immovable rock amid the ocean of existence, to arrest and beat back the waves of unbelief and to reflect the glories of Divine power and wisdom.

We might add other arguments corroborative of the same principle. But if the three which we have adduced, independent and cumulative as they are, do not satisfy, we despair of producing conviction. We may be laboring under some hallucination on this subject ; but we cannot see why the evidence of special Divine interpositions in nature is not as clear and decided as in revelation. The only difference seems to be, that in the one case we depend on the testimony of living witnesses ; in the other, upon the conclusions of science. But if such interpositions have been made in nature, it is easy to see how important are the bearings of the fact both upon theology and upon piety.

See, for example, how the miracles of nature take away all presumption against the miracles of revelation. We all know that this has been a favorite point of attack, both in ancient and especially in modern times. The grand argument has been, that miracles, being contrary to all experience and all analogy, cannot be proved by human testimony. We remember the metaphysical network woven by Hume on this subject, which he fancied too strong for any Christian champion to break through ; and we know too, how many professed Christians at this day assume in their theology that miracles are only ingenious myths. Little did these men imagine what a record on this subject lay concealed within the stony leaves of the earth's crust ; or that the hammer of the miner and the geologist would bring facts to light that would sweep away at once all their ingenious quibbles. So long as Christians could meet them only with abstract reasoning, they felt strong. But now we lay open the solid rocks and show them there miracles of crea-

tion as wonderful as the miracles of revelation, and of them, the creation of man, perhaps the most remarkable of all, is the same in both records. We show them, that interference with nature's usual course has been a rule of God's government from the remotest times; and the conclusion is irresistible, that what God has done, during the earlier economies of our world, he will be likely to repeat during the human era, should his purposes require it.

Not less effectually does this subject remove all improbability from the doctrine of special providence in the case of individuals and communities. Nay, the facts which we have presented form an *a fortiori* argument for the exercise of such a providence. For if we find proof registered on the rocks, that God has taken care to adapt the state of the world wisely and benevolently to the nature and wants of the lower animals that have peopled its changing surface, and prospectively and specially for the comfort and happiness of man as a race, we may with still stronger confidence presume that He will see to it that the exigencies of individuals of that superior race will be taken care of. Henceforth, then, when we witness the exhumation, from the quarries, of the strange beings that once occupied the earth, let us not regard them as mere objects of an idle curiosity, but as so many arguments to show us that God will take care of our individual interests; and when we wander through the deep seated coal-mine, or any other excavation where human industry is extracting mineral treasures to advance civilization and happiness, let our faith gather thence an argument for implicit trust in that providence which, in the depths of past ages, buried up these deposits for the special use of civilized man. How delightful for the Christian thus to find food to nourish his faith, where most men see only rugged rocks and think only of accumulating wealth.

So, too, this subject takes away all presumption against the doctrine of special Divine influence on the human mind. For if God would work miracles to accomplish his purposes in the natural world, much more ought we to expect that He would exert those influences upon the human mind, which are not inconsistent with free agency, and are essential to prepare it for a higher state of existence. This he can do without a miracle; and it is an exigency which the whole history of his providence leads us to expect will be met in this manner.

See, too, what a new and interesting argument may be derived from this subject for the Divine existence. The usual argument, that from design, requires us to prove, or assume, a beginning to the matter of the universe; and here the atheist, hiding himself in the fogs of the doctrine of chance, and an eternal series of things, can make a quite formidable show of argument. But admitting miracles in the modifications of matter, we need not carry our thoughts back beyond those modifications, and may leave the question of the origin of matter untouched, without any injury to atheism. We thus get rid of a multitude of dreamy abstractions, which have so long enveloped the argument for the Divine existence, with a mist. We force the atheist out of the obscurities of the deductive, into the clear light of the inductive, philosophy. We bring the subject down from the airy region of metaphysics and place it on the firm ground of common sense.

This subject, also, may be made to subserve another purpose, no less important. It aims a deadly blow at all those subtle systems of religion founded on the supposed unending uniformity of nature's laws, and their inherent power to accomplish all the changes of the organic and inorganic worlds. Some of these systems, as we have remarked in another connection, admit that there might be a Deity to ordain these laws originally; but that is a question of no great importance, since it is the laws themselves and not Divine intervention that has taken the world in the state of nebulous vapor, condensed it into a sphere, brought in at first a few species of animals and plants of the simplest organization, in the state of monads, and from them gradually developed all the higher forms of life by the force of external circumstances and an internal tendency to improvement, until, at length, as the last act of the drama, man in the form of the negro race was evolved from the semi-quadrupedal orang, and still pressing onward has assumed the loftier character of the Caucasian.

Now, either the entire history of our globe, which has been dug out of its stony archives, is false, or this hypothesis is untrue. The history is based on facts, gathered from a thousand fields, widely scattered, yet all teaching the same lesson; the hypothesis is speculation merely, springing from a few supposed facts, half buried in fog and twilight. Which shall we adopt? Philosophy cries out, responsive to the voice of nature: It is God, and not mere law; an infinitely wise and powerful God, the God

who doeth wonders, whose miraculous interpositions are recorded in the volume of nature as well as in the volume of revelation.

Finally, this subject identifies the God of nature with the God of revelation. We greatly mistake the general sentiments of mankind, if they do not feel that the Deity recognized by science, is a quite different being from the Jehovah of the Scriptures. The first is regarded, indeed, as infinitely perfect, but as distant and uninterested in human affairs; binding the iron chain of law around all created things. But the God of revelation is an infinite Father, who is ever near his children, watching their every step, with an ear ever open and quick to hear their cry for help, and with a heart of boundless love to sympathize with them in all their trials. It is these different aspects in which the Deity is presented, that makes the religious man jealous of those views of theology which science offers; and it is because he does not wish to feel that God is so near, and so observant of his actions and thoughts, that often the scientific man is disgusted with the God of revelation. But this subject shows us the same God in both dispensations. He who so often interposed miraculously for his ancient chosen people, and providentially, at least, for the followers of Christ in every age, that same God, as modern science informs us, has shown the same watchful care over the material creation in all ages, and specially interposed, whenever necessary, for the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings. And herein does the pious heart recognize, in the God whose glory is seen in the heavens, and who has filled this lower world with beauty, the same infinite Father, whose wisdom and mercy shine so gloriously in the plan of redemption.

If these views be correct, do they not give to the works of creation a double charm to the Christian heart? And do they not suggest the inquiry, whether those who preach the Gospel might not make much more use than they do of natural religion? If we mistake not, there is a prevalent jealousy of facts and principles derived from nature; just because those facts have been sometimes perverted to throw discredit upon revelation. But we have long been satisfied that, from the fields of natural science, efficient support may be derived to some of the peculiar, and to the carnal mind, the most offensive, doctrines of revelation. We have brought forward in this Article, only a single cluster of the fruit from that field. But other and richer clusters, we doubt not, would reward the search of abler minds.

See what such men as Chalmers and Harris have done; and let all who now preach, or who mean to preach the Gospel, follow in their steps, and we doubt not that Christians, instead of being fearful that science and revelation are in conflict, would find that they sustain and illustrate each other, and that the heart of piety might be warmed at the shrine of nature, as well as at the cross; for, in an important sense, the cross may be found in nature, and nature in the cross.

But, after all, the tendency of the age is to substitute that which is artificial for that which is natural. Hence it is, that the Christian passes with indifference the works of God, while his soul rouses and his eye brightens when it turns to the works of man. Oh, what a magnificent temple it is which Jehovah has made our dwelling place! It is a vast whispering gallery, echoing and reëchoing with his name and his praise. How much do they lose, who always have its vast dome above them, and its lofty columns around them, and yet hear none of those whispers or echoes, nor feel any of the inspiration of the place; but whose supreme attention is devoted to "the gewgaws and trinkets, the puppet shows and histrionic feats, which fashion, and ambition, and sensuality, have surreptitiously introduced there." How insensible to every noble impulse has his heart become, who has neither eye nor ear for the charms of nature. For she is the kind mother of us all. In her arms were we cradled, on her bosom were we nursed, and her voice falls on every well-attuned ear like the music of heaven. It is, indeed, the music of heaven; for nature's harmonies are but a transcript of the Divine perfections, and her voice is, therefore, the voice of God.

We fear, however, that such sentiments do not accord with the experience of most Christians. They look upon the system of nature as a field well-adapted to regale the fancy, gratify the taste, and delightfully exercise the understanding; but not to warm the heart and feed the spiritual taste of piety. Creation is, indeed, a splendid temple, but it is cold and lifeless. No sacred fire burns upon the altar. No crucified Redeemer is there to fix the attention and absorb the affections; no Spirit of grace speaks gently to the soul. The religion of sentimentalism may flourish by communion with nature; but the piety that saves the soul and blesses the world must seek for its nourishment at the foot of the cross.

True, it is at the cross we must learn how to be saved and how to save others. But because we cleave with supreme affection to the God of redemption, must we abjure the God of nature? If it feed our devotion to muse on the character of that God who devised and executed the marvellous plan of redemption by a long series of miracles in human history, shall it afford no nourishment to our new-born nature to find that the Author of this vast universe has interposed, in a no less special and wonderful manner, to fit up this world that it might become a proper theatre for the display of redeeming love? Is there not something wrong in our hearts, if we do not recognize the same wonder-working beneficent God in the natural as in the moral world? Creation and redemption are but parts of one great system, and we may not disjoin what God has united; neither may we depreciate one part of the scheme in order to exalt the other. We will try to unite them in our experience as well as in our judgment. Then shall we see the same great truths imprinted upon nature which shine forth in redemption. Then shall all our communion with nature serve only to strengthen our love of the cross, while the more powerfully we are constrained by the love of Christ, the more delightfully and profitably shall we wander among the works of God. Oh, how meagre is his enjoyment of creation's beauties, who looks at them with only the eye of the cold calculating philosopher, or the mere enthusiasm of the poet, but not with a Christian's heart! It is only such a heart that can vivify the scenes of the natural world, with the presence of God. Nature has charms, indeed, for the mere man of taste, and of philosophy. But it is not till we bring in the religious element, that the affection becomes such as God would have it, a pure and a sanctifying emotion.

It is no wonder that such a love as this should be a deep fountain of happiness in every condition of life. It does not, like almost all earthly affections, become weaker with advancing life, when the pressure of cares, disappointments, and the infirmities of advancing years, come upon us. The man may become weary of the world and be deserted by it. Feeble health may infuse wormwood into the common pleasures of life; treachery and ingratitude may convert professed friends into enemies, and pierce his heart with many a pang; and old age, with its failing senses and failing powers, may deaden his sensibilities to almost everything else; but if in early life a religious love of nature

has taken possession of his soul, he will ever find it a sweet solace in the hour of desertion and bereavement; and, even amid the frosts of old age, the sacred flame, less bright only than his immortal hopes, shall spread a sweet light along his dark passage to the grave.

Such a view of nature as this was taken by the writers of the Bible. The labored distinctions which we make between common and miraculous events, were unknown to them. In every event they saw and joyfully recognized God's hand, and hence it so often happens that the sentence which begins with praise to the God of nature, ends with ascriptions of glory to the Redeemer.

Nor is this all; for these same views of this subject are taken in heaven. For the redeemed from among men, as they stand upon the sea of glass, and sing the song of Moses and the Lamb, exclaim: *Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty.* Yet these ransomed ones are ever ready to join in what seems the common chorus of heaven: *Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever.* In heaven, therefore, at least, will the God whom science describes, be identified with the God of redemption. Would that it were so on earth! It will be, when educated men, especially ministers of the Gospel, shall have fully developed the harmonies between nature and revelation. Here, then, is an object, second only to that of the personal salvation of men, inviting the labors of those who go forth, after long years of preparation, from our Theological Seminaries, burning with the desire to do what they can for the good of man and the glory of God. The field is open and inviting, and the ripening grain abundant. May those who take the sickle, have a large share in so noble a work, and late in life return, *bringing their sheaves with them.*

ARTICLE V.

PAGANIZED ECCLESIASTICISM, THE CHIEF ANTAGONIST OF THE MODERN MISSIONARY.¹

By Rev. Joseph P. Thompson, New York.

THAT a *school of theology* should also be a *school of missions*, accords alike with the philosophy and the history of Christianity. If, as a late writer² on the History of the Apostolic Church suggests, we are yet in the Pauline age, intermediate between the age of ceremonial order and the age of sympathetic fusion, then do we but imitate our great Apostolic type in blending the missionary spirit with the polemical. The greatest of theologians was also the first and the greatest of missionaries.

In studying Christianity under its missionary aspect, our thoughts at once revert to ANTIOCH, the historic centre of Christian missions. That luxurious capital of the Macedonian kingdom of Syria — then the seat of the Roman government in the East, and the third city of the empire, rivalling Alexandria in wealth and population, and vying with Rome itself in the magnificence of its festivals — was the first city of the Gentiles in which Christianity gained a footing, and gathered a church without the pale of the synagogue. The converts of the Pentecost, scattered from Jerusalem by the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled northward along the sea-coast of Phœnicia, visited the adjacent island of Cyprus, and found a refuge in Antioch, three hundred miles distant from the Jewish capital, where, under the immunities granted to the Jews by the Seleucidae and confirmed by the Caesars, this new sect of Judaism, as it was regarded, might grow without molestation. Here, in the old exclusive spirit of the circumcision, they “preached the word to none but to the Jews only,” until certain Hellenists from Cyprus and the northern coast of Africa, not sharing in the exclusiveness of the Palestinian Jews, “spoke openly to the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus.”

¹ An Address before the Society of Inquiry in Andover Theological Seminary, July 31, 1854.

² Dr. Philip Schaff.

The marvellous report of this first open movement without the synagogue, hastened to Antioch Barnabas from Jerusalem, and Paul from Tarsus; who labored together at Antioch for a whole year. So numerous were the converts to the Gospel, that, even in a population of two hundred thousand, they became conspicuous as a distinct and self-existent community; and they whom the Jews had stigmatized as "Galileans" and "Nazarenes," and who were known to each other as "the disciples," "the brethren," and "the saints," were there for the first time called "Christians," by the contemptuous Greeks. And now the genius of Christianity for sympathy and diffusion began to be developed. Contributions for the relief of the brethren in Judea, then suffering by famine, were sent to Jerusalem by the hands of Barnabas and Saul; and, on the return of the apostles from this ministration, they were inaugurated by the Holy Ghost, through the church at Antioch, for the work of missions to the Gentile world. As Jerusalem was the seat of development, so was Antioch the centre of propagation.

For centuries the Syrian capital maintained the distinction thus conferred upon it as the mother of missions; and the mother of all Roman Asia, whom Cicero celebrates for men of learning and for the cultivation of the arts, became eminent for the eloquence of her bishops, the heroism of her martyrs, and the abundance of her Christian charities. Here Ignatius presided over the church for forty years, until he was led in chains to Rome to seal his testimony with his blood; and here, of the wise and holy Anthusa, was born and nurtured the golden-mouthed bishop of Constantinople. In this gorgeous seat of idolatry, where the shades of Daphne, tuneful with fountains and redolent of odors, allured a luxurious people to the sensual rites of Apollo and Diana; where the Delphic oracle was reproduced, and the Olympic games were imitated at immense cost, Christianity won to itself a hundred thousand disciples, established schools of learning, and maintained annually three thousand poor.

Such are the memories of Antioch, that carry us back to this historic centre of Christian missions. We go back of Mills, and Nott, and Hall, of Carey, and Martyn, and Brainerd; we go back of Reformers and Crusaders; of missionary bishops and wandering monks; we go back even of martyrs and confessors whose blood was as scattered seed; we go back to Barnabas and Saul, the head of that illustrious catalogue whom the Holy Ghost hath

separated to Himself for this work; and, traversing that same Mediterranean upon which the Gospel first launched forth on its mission to all nations, to where the broad bay of Issus sweeps the battle-field of Alexander and Darius, and casting anchor in the choked and deserted harbor of *Seleucia*, that once cradled the commerce of the Euphrates and the Indies borne westward through the passes of Lebanon, and from which the first missionaries to the heathen embarked, with a richer freight than that of Ormus and of Ind, we there inquire for the fruits of missionary enterprise; for its stability through the changes of empire; for its labors, its obstacles, and its successes; for the record of the Gospel in the city where the disciples were first called Christians and first became missionaries. Alas! that same Antioch now calls for some Barnabas and Saul to rebuild her wastes. Above her ruin towers, as of old, the majestic front of Lebanon, and by her side still rushes the Orontes, bearing the mountain snows and torrents to the sea. The grove of Daphne is no more; the Castalian fount is silent; and the marble statue of the God of Light with his golden bow lies in indistinguishable dust among the ruins of his temple. But the church where Paul preached, where Ignatius ministered, and where Chrysostom was nurtured, is no more. Christianity is dead in the city where first she was baptized. The minaret of the Prophet beetles over the ruins of the Roman wall, the Grecian temple, and the Christian church. Nay, sadder still; the heathenism that Paul there vanquished, has entered into the form of Christianity itself, and, in all that eastern world, a PAGANIZED ECCLESIASTICISM confronts the missionary of the cross with an opposition more intense and a barrier more formidable than did ever the original idolatry there enshrined. This now is everywhere throughout the East, and this is destined to be everywhere throughout the world, the mightiest foe of a free and pure Gospel. Where the old Paganism is dead, where Mohammedanism is wasting away, this Paganized Ecclesiasticism stands, the unrelenting adversary of the faith of Christ.

In one form or another — Romish, Greek, Armenian, Copt — this is now the chief antagonism to the Gospel in the eastern world. The forces encountered by Paul when he traversed that same region, were a Pharisaic Judaism, a speculative and sceptical philosophy, and a corrupt and vindictive Paganism. Now Judaism as an organized and hostile force has disappeared; the

dialectic schools of Greece have vanished; and Paganism, throughout the East, has fallen before the name of Christ. The Koran, indeed, holds nominal sway over more than a hundred millions of men; but Mohammedanism exists rather as a political and social barrier to any foreign religion, than as a vital religious antagonism to the Gospel of Christ. As a tangible system of faith, Mohammedanism is well-nigh *effete*. Its genius for propagandism has burnt itself out. It makes no advances; it gains no converts and no territories. It doggedly yields to the destiny that decrees its doom. The crescent pales before the cross; not that Nicholas is a Godfrey, or Napoleon a saint, but that Islam himself is an unbeliever.¹

Not so that gigantic usurpation of the Christian name which holds at once the chairs of apostles, the thrones of emperors, and the seats of gods. In this a Pharisaic Judaism and a persecuting Paganism still live, and live in vigorous hostility to the same primitive faith that they opposed in their separate forms. Here is an antagonism to the Gospel that Paul found not, either at Jerusalem, at Antioch, at Ephesus, at Corinth, or at Rome; but that now is found "all round about from Jerusalem to Illyricum," in all continental Europe, in South America, in Asia, in Africa, in the islands of the sea; wherever the missionary goes, the most formidable because the most subtle and unscrupulous of all his adversaries. This opposition Paul foresaw, but could not himself experience. The modern missionary must encounter it, and illy is he prepared for his work who has not measured its strength and its subtleties. In the cities where Paul successively encountered Judaism, Theosophism and Paganism, at Jerusalem, at Athens, and at Rome, this conglomerate formed of the detritus of systems that the Gospel then crushed, is set up in their stead in the name of Christianity. Inverting the order of these chief cities, we may trace from Rome to Jerusalem the power of a PAGANIZED ECCLESIASTICISM, through all the coasts and cities where the Apostle to the Gentiles "fully preached the Gospel of Christ."

As Paul was led into the Roman Forum under the escort of Julius toward the Pretorium on the Palatine hill, he saw, as at

¹ Notwithstanding the present success of the Turks against the Russians, in which every friend of missions must rejoice, Mohammedanism is destined soon to fall, either through foreign conquest, or by concessions to foreign alliance, or from inherent weakness.

Athens, a city filled with idols. To the right of the Sacred Way, that from the days of Romulus had been consecrated to processions in honor of the gods, on the far northern side of the crowded area, where the forums of Augustus and of Caesar joined upon the original forum of the people, he would see the magnificent temple reared by Augustus to *Avenging Mars*; and that famed temple of *Venus Genetrix*, where the conqueror of Egypt, himself vanquished by the "fair frailty" of the Ptolemaic Queen, had erected a statue of Cleopatra

"Oerpicturing that Venus, where we see
The fancy outwork nature;"

and where the conqueror of Gaul, demanding with imperial pomp the homage of the conscript fathers, had kindled that fire of hate that was quenched only with his blood.

On his immediate left, where the palace of Nero, sweeping down to the base of the Palatine mount, almost encroached upon the Forum, he would see the elegant portico of the temple of Castor and Pollux, then the vestibule of the new palace, with its gilded equestrian statues of the twin divinities; and, in advance of this, and almost on the line of the Sacred Way, adjoining the superb senate-house of Augustus, the temple of *Minerva Chalcidica*, built by the same emperor, the chief ornament of the Forum, as its fragmentary remains are now the chief model of the architect. Around the southern slope of the Palatine, bearing off toward the Tiber, he would see the little circular temple of *Romulus*, enclosing the bronze statue of the suckling wolf which Cicero has immortalized, and which you may still see in the Capitol; and the memorable temple built by the second king of Rome, where vestal virgins fed the sacred fire, and guarded the Palladium brought by Aeneas from the siege of Troy. Here, also, were the sacred wood and the fountain of *Juturna*, where the twin deities had rested on their hasty and mysterious visit to the city, and whose waters gave forth healing virtue; and just beyond, upon the edge of the marshy *Velabrum*, the temple of *Jupiter Stator*, another monument of that Imperial Augustus, who "found Rome brick and left it marble."

Such was Paul's first glance at Pagan Rome, as he walked up the Sacred Way toward the palace of that Caesar to whom he had appealed his cause. But all this imposing array of temples, like the majestic propylaea of Carnac, served only to adorn

the way to the central group upon the Capitoline Hill; where, facing the Forum in close contiguity, stood the granite temple of Saturn, the repository of the sacred treasury and the archives of the State; the ancient temple of Concord, renowned in the trial of the Catiline conspirators; and the gorgeous votive temple of Augustus to the Thundering Jove,¹ commemorative of the bolt that felled his servant but left himself unharmed; while upon the northern brow of this double-crowned eminence stood the oldest religious structure of the capital, the massive temple of JUPITER FERETRIUS of the date of Romulus; and on the other front, the pride and wonder of ancient Rome, that triple temple of the Capitol, known as the *Jupiter Capitolinus*, but dedicated to *Jupiter*, to *Minerva*, and to *Juno*, whose several cellae were under one façade, enriched in the highest style of art, when art was at its zenith; a marble structure, two hundred feet in length and of nearly equal breadth, with double rows of columns upon either side, and, where it faced the Forum, a triple row of majestic pillars of Pentelic marble, the plunder of the temple of Olympian Jove, on which Paul had looked on the banks of the Ilissus; the whole surface of the mount being thus adorned with sacred edifices, which, in number, in riches, and in splendor, as well as in arrangement and effect, were rivalled only, scarce excelled, by the immortal group of the Acropolis at Athens.

A residence of two years at Rome as a prisoner at large, with no further restriction upon his personal liberty than the presence of the soldier to whom he was chained, made Paul familiar with those temples of Pagan worship whose ruins the traveller now seeks as memorials of antiquity, and as landmarks of the ancient city. In those two years he may have witnessed an oration to some victorious general returning from a foreign campaign; some Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian or Titus, then just rising into fame, and who afterwards in such quick succession followed the tyrant Nero on the throne; and here upon the Capitol, where the bronze statue of the Father of the gods sat with extended foot to receive the homage of the world, he must have seen the imposing pageants of the worship of the imperial city to Imperial Jove.

Rome, like Athens, was crowded with the symbols of idolatry. Not only was the Capitoline, like the Acropolis, converted into

¹ The site of the temple of *Jupiter Tonans* has been much disputed; but it was either on the Capitoline or near its base.

one vast temple embraced within the citadel as the symbol of Divine protection over the State; not only was the *Forum*, like the *Agora*, lined with temples, as if the gods had made this their habitation, and emperors and people had made their *cultus* the beginning and the end of life; but everywhere within the circumference of eight miles traced by the walls of the city, and even without the walls, were temples to divinities under every name and character, and commemorative of all great events of the State as kingdom, republic and empire; each marking some era of historic interest and appropriating the guardian offices of some new divinity, and all spread out in one imposing panorama from the summit of the Capitoline hill. On the island of the Tiber towered the mast-like obelisk of the huge nautiform temple of Aesculapius, whose serpent there deposited, had stayed the plague in the fifth century of Rome. In every *curia* or ward, Vesta had her unique shrine, her consecrated virgins, and her sacred fire. Apollo, Juno, Minerva, Venus and Heroules, Hope, Piety and Modesty, Ceres, Proserpine and Fortune, even Isis and Serapis, borrowed from Egypt, had their several temples, and the dome of the etherial Pantheon imaged the abode of all the gods.

But while Paul found idolatry thus entrenched at Rome, he found there also not a few who loved that Saviour whom he preached. The mention by name, in the Epistle to the Romans, that preceded by some years his visit to Rome, of twenty-eight persons and households in that city already favorably known to Paul as the servants of Christ; and the allusion to other brethren and saints, and to the church meeting in the house of Aquila and Priscilla, show that the Gospel had a strong hold in the capital. No Apostle had there preceded Paul, nor as yet is there any mention even of bishops and deacons;¹ but the faith of the *saints* in that city "is spoken of throughout the whole world;" and their zeal and courage were displayed when they went in a body a distance of forty miles to meet the illustrious prisoner upon the Appian way.

The toleration of the Roman empire toward the divinities and the rites of conquered nations, so long as these did not conflict

¹ If Peter had ever been at Rome, it is impossible that Paul, who is a model of courtesy, should have omitted to allude to him in this Epistle; or if there was a bishop there, that he should have omitted to salute him, as he does the bishops at Philippi.

with the established religion, had brought idolatry into contempt by putting in competition for religious homage the heterogeneous divinities of the whole world. Judaism was tolerated also, because, while intensely hostile to idolatry, it was exclusive and not proselyting; and Christians were at first regarded only as a minor sect among the Jews. Rome was an inviting field to the Apostle of the Gentiles; and, during the long delay occasioned by the non-appearance of his prosecutors, and by the indifference of the emperor to a question of religion, "Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no MAN FORBIDDING HIM." The soldier to whom he was chained made no complaint of his preaching; and even some of the emperor's own household were begotten in his bonds.

When, however, it became apparent that the Christians were not a mere sect of the Jews, but the teachers of a "new way," and that a way which threatened to subvert all existing forms of religion; that Christianity was propagandism against the religion of the State, not with proud and impotent scorn, but with earnest and effective zeal, then the inoffensive prisoner brought from Caesarea became a marked man, and was dragged from his private house to the dungeon of Tullius. Here he felt that the idolatry of the Forum was no empty form.

At the north-western angle of the Forum, sunk in the rocky base of the Capitoline hill, without light or air, save such as might creep in at the aperture by which prisoners were lowered into them, were the dungeons of the Mamertine prison. Here, while the area above was thronged with the spectators of some idol-feast, and perchance even the noise of sacrifice or the revelry of the Saturnalia penetrated his dungeon walls, upon his pillar of stone, cold, hungry, dark, weary, yet triumphant in a living faith, lay the expectant martyr, "ready to be offered, and knowing that the time of his departure was at hand."

If after this he was set at liberty awhile, and visited Spain, and possibly Britain, he returned to Rome just when Nero, having feasted his fiendish passions with a burning city, determined to expiate the crime with the blood of the saints. Then Paul, the aged, no longer willing to abide in the flesh, departed to be with Christ. But whenever and however he yielded up his mission, we know that for two whole years, under the dominant

Paganism of Rome, Paul preached in that city the kingdom of God, with all boldness, no man forbidding him. How fares the Gospel now, in the city where the first missionary finished his work? What forces now favor, and what oppose, that truth for which he died?

No turbulent synagogue of the Jews is here; no imperial Paganism now gluts the passions of the mob with the sight of Christians burnt alive in coats of bitumen, or torn asunder by furious beasts. Here is the nominal centre of Christendom. Yet here, also, is the real centre of that PAGANIZED ECCLESIASTICISM, which, more than Jew or Pagan ever could, crushes out the life of a free and spiritual Christianity. The picture of modern Rome laid over that of the Rome of Paul's age, will present at once the fact and the argument. The picture is taken at the point which commemorates the inauguration of the Christian religion in the world.¹

We are in Rome on Friday, the 24th day of December. Following the Corso, the main street of the city, which marks the old Flaminian way, we pass over or around the Capitoline hill, and enter the Forum, whose straggling columns and disturbed foundations still witness for the grandeur of ancient Rome. The first thought that strikes us is, that the idolatry that Paul here saw enshrined in a score of temples, has passed utterly away, and that the religion of Christ is built upon its ruins; for, on the site of ruined temples, and built of their materials, are churches dedicated to the Christian martyrs, and crowned with the glittering symbol of the cross. The golden palace of Nero on yonder slope is supplanted by the villa of an English gentleman; and a Franciscan convent faces the Forum on the Palatine hill, now nearly overgrown with cultivated vines and wild acanthus weeds. Every outward sign would indicate that we are in a Christian city. Here, where Paul witnessed the licentious orgies practised at this season in honor of Saturn; here, where he saw the gorgeous processions of priests sweeping from temple to temple, and heard the boisterous mirth of the multitude let loose to riot in the name of religion, we find no vestige of the Pagan empire that then ruled the world, save here and there an arch, a column, or a half-effaced inscription on a broken tablet. If here is the arch of Titus, whose bas-reliefs commemorate the triumph of Pagan arms over the city and the people of God, yonder is the

¹ The writer was in Rome during Christmas week in 1852.

arch of Constantine that commemorates the first Christian emperor of Rome, who abolished idolatry by imperial edict, and emblazoned on his standard the symbol of the cross. Beyond the Forum we enter the Colosseum, that stupendous arena erected for the gladiatorial shows of Rome; within whose walls more than eighty thousand spectators were wont to assemble to see the hated Christians thrown to the infuriated beasts. In the centre of this arena, perhaps on the very spot where Ignatius of Antioch was devoured by the lions, stands a lofty cross, and around it statues of our Saviour's passion. Papal benediction has consecrated the Colosseum to the memory of its own martyrs; and here, on every Friday, from a rude pulpit, a monk preaches where those martyrs bled. This surely is a Christian city. How would Paul rejoice at such a contrast with the old Saturnalia of Rome!

But let us see if *things* have changed with names. Yonder is a score of beggars, lame and blind, climbing up the pedestal of the cross and kneeling to kiss the sacred symbol. We draw near and read: "For every kiss an indulgence of two hundred days." These statues of Christ, rude, barbarous as works of art, are they not regarded with a veneration even more gross and stupid than that with which the statues of Pagan divinities were here honored? Is this after all a Christian city? Is the old Paganism quite dead?

The bells now summon us across the Tiber to the modern centre of power and of religion in Rome; and hurrying thither we enter the vast and beautiful *piazza* of St. Peter's. In the centre of a paved semicircular area, whose chord measures seven hundred and fifty feet, stands an obelisk brought by Caligula from Heliopolis in Egypt, and dedicated to heathen memories, but now surmounted by the cross, and covered with Christian inscriptions. On either side of it fountains are playing. A fine colonnade, sixty feet in width, encompasses the piazza on either hand, and leads you to the portico of St. Peter's, which crowns the arc of the piazza with its majestic façade of Corinthian columns, surmounted by colossal statues of Christ and his Apostles. Another step, and you are within that stupendous structure, which is to the Christianity of modern Rome what the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was to the Paganism of ancient Rome, its material embodiment and its highest expression. Here you behold the triumph of Christian art, from Raphael and Michael Angelo to Bernini; an art fostered by the wealth and piety of

centuries, aided by the contributions of a continent, and by the levies of indulgences from the realms of the dead and the ages of futurity.

"Since Zion's desolation, when that He
Forsook his former city, what could be,
Of earthly structures, in his honor piled,
Of a sublimer aspect? Majesty,
Power, glory, strength, and beauty — all are aided
In this eternal ark of worship undefiled."

"Undefiled?" That is our query. But we may not now linger in the church, for, though the brilliant array of carriages along the colonnades betokens some religious service, that is just now in another place. It is the hour for Vespers at the Sistine Chapel, in the adjoining palace of the Vatican. Entering the colonnade on the right, we pass an armed guard stationed at the foot of the grand staircase; for the prayer-meeting to be conducted by the head of the Catholic Church, can be entered only through a file of soldiers. Half-way up the stairs is a guard of another sort; a master of dress, who requires us to lay aside overcoats, umbrellas and canes, and who denies admittance, if gentlemen are in frock-coats, and ladies are in bonnets; a dress-coat for gentlemen, a veil for ladies, being the etiquette of the Pope's prayer-meeting. But one should not cavil at this, since, in some Protestant churches of New York, dress-coats, white kid gloves, and well-trimmed coiffures are understood to be the order, especially on Confirmation days. Passing through the grand lobby or audience chamber of the Pontiff, decorated with frescoes commemorative of the triumphs of the church — and among these the Massacre of St. Bartholemew — and wedging our way through ranks of soldiers and a throng of spectators, we gain a position near the inner railing of the lofty oblong apartment of the chapel. Before us is the grand judgment scene of Michael Angelo; above us are his frescoed stories of the Old and New Testaments; but we are here for worship, not for art. We stand facing the altar; on the other three sides of the chapel sit the dignitaries of the church, in their brilliant costume of scarlet and gold, each with an attendant to adjust his robes. On the left, near the altar, is a throne-chair for the Pontiff, and opposite, in a small gallery, is the famous choir, whose unnatural tones betray the crime against humanity that here subserves the piety of the Christian, as elsewhere it subserves the jealousy of the Turk.

At the entrance of the Pope, the cardinals severally bow before him, kissing his covered hand. Next, sundry attendants adjust his mitre and robes, which are changed several times during the ceremony; so that, with robing and disrobing, shifting mitres, smoothing down vestments, and the homage of attendants passing and repassing the papal chair, the attention is quite divided between the devotions of his Holiness and his toilet. Other attendants bring to him the books of the Gospels and Epistles, or reverently lead him to the reading-desk, and hold the candles while he reads. The Pope and cardinals being duly perfumed with incense, the mass is chanted, and the host is consecrated with idolatrous homage, all worshippers saluting it on bended knee.

The service over, you retire, with a confused impression of gorgeous frescoes, rich green carpets and red cushions, scarlet cloaks with ermine collars, glittering mitres, fragrant incense, unnatural music, bowings, prostrations, trailing robes and brisk attendants; but with no impression of solemnity as in the presence of God, or of religious joy as at the advent of the Saviour of the world.

At evening you wend your way to the church of *St. Maria Maggiore*; the principal of some twenty churches in Rome consecrated to the Virgin Mary. The site of this building, we are told, was indicated by a miraculous fall of snow in August, covering the exact space whereon it should be built; a poor imitation of the old Pagan legend of a shower of stones upon Mt. Alba in token of the displeasure of the gods at the neglect of their worship.

The street leading to the church is illuminated with torches and with numerous lights of various colors; soldiers are marching, bands are playing, crowds are hurrying on; and, as you enter the great area in front of the church, where stands another obelisk brought from Pagan Egypt to Pagan Rome, now covered with Christian inscriptions, and look upon the huge edifice, whose doors are thronged with the masses from town and country, eager to witness the ceremonial of the nativity, you catch for a moment the enthusiasm of the scene, and feel that surely the Christian faith has life and power in Rome. Here, as at the Sistine, you enter through a guard of soldiers; and feel yourself under military surveillance. The church impresses you with its adaptation, not for preaching or for united worship, but for reli-

gious spectacles. The simple grandeur of the architecture, the splendor of the decorations, the wealth of marble, jasper, porphyry, silver and gold lavished upon the side chapels, the massive carving and gilding of the roof, the altar of porphyry surmounted by six bronze angels, the marble columns festooned with red cloth, the blaze of gilt candelabras hung from pavement to ceiling, the intoning of the service, with the responses of the choir; all this arrests you on the moment, and prepares you for a ceremony of no ordinary significance. A commotion at one extremity of the church attracts you thither; and there, seated under a crimson canopy, borne slowly upon the shoulders of men, preceded by a military guard, and surrounded by a shoal of ecclesiastics bearing lighted candles and various insignia, moves the Pope, bestowing his benediction upon the people, who kneel on all sides to receive it. He halts to render homage at the gorgeous chapel of Sixtus V., and then is borne to the choir to participate in the service at the high altar.

Long and wearisome is the chanting, unintelligible from the distance; manifold are the bowings and crossings at the altar as the mass proceeds; till, after some three hours' waiting, you again observe a commotion at the chapel where the Pope did homage. But now the stir is not for him. In that chapel is said to be kept the cradle of Christ, encased in a silver crib, and this is now to be exhibited for the adoration of the people. On each side of the nave, which measures 280 feet in length by 50 feet in width, is stationed a file of grenadiers to keep clear a passage for the grand procession. Some fifty ecclesiastics in canonicals, walking two and two, each carrying a huge lighted candle, some looking demure and scholarly, others gross and sensual, others light-minded and chatty, move slowly up the nave to the sound of chanting, and herald the advent of the silver cradle. This, with its doll bedecked with finery and jewels, is borne aloft on poles, and deposited upon the high altar. The common people do it reverence as it passes, and, at the altar, the officiating clergy bow to this doll in its silver cradle, as the Magi bowed in adoration before the babe in the manger.

Is this a Christian service, or some old Pagan rite revived? This is not merely the act of ignorant peasants, to whose superstition something might be pardoned; it is an act in which the Pope himself participates; the civil head of the Roman State, and the ecclesiastical head of the Roman Catholic Church, hav-

ing himself received the homage of his subjects, now renders homage to the doll in the silver cradle. This holy cradle has assigned to it the most sacred spot in all the church. Upon the high altar, before which the priests kneel in their daily offices, and which none may pass without saluting, this cradle stands on Christmas day to claim the homage of each worshipper. At Bethlehem pilgrims kiss the manger in which Christ was laid; at Rome the manger of stone is transmuted into a cradle of silver. Is Rome a Christian or a Pagan city?

We renew the inquiry in front of the church. The colossal obelisk, surmounted with the cross, boasts the triumph of Christianity over Paganism; but beside this is a marble pillar, surmounted with a bronze statue of the virgin *Mary*, standing upon the half-moon, now worshipped in place of the virgin *Diana*, who, with the crescent on her head, was worshipped here as the queen of heaven. Is the religion of Rome changed except in name?

The morning of Christmas is ushered in with roar of artillery from the castle of St. Angelo, and Rome awakes to know a Saviour born. At nine o'clock we repair to St. Peter's. We are yet early for the mass, and will spend a moment in taking in a conception of the place in which we stand. If the nave of St. Maria Maggiore seemed vast, this is stupendous; twice as long, twice as high, and four times as wide as the nave of the Crystal Palace in New York; you could place within it twelve Broadway Tabernacles in double row.¹ The dome, wider by half than the dome of the palace, and at its apex four times the height of that from the pavement, rests on four piers of stone, each 230 feet in circumference. Under the dome is the tomb of St. Peter, illuminated night and day with lamps of silver and gold. Beyond the tomb is the high altar, with its stupendous canopy of bronze, adorned with forty thousand dollars worth of gold. Against the rear wall of the church is the stone chair of St. Peter. The chair is superbly dressed with red cloth, and carpeted. Here are two thrones for the Pope, at different elevations, and seats for the cardinals. On each side of the tomb of St. Peter, a space is railed off for visitors, who are admitted only in full dress. No frock-coat, though of the scantiest pattern, no bonnet, though it cover less than half the head, can enter that sacred enclosure;

¹ We speak here of the nave only; without estimating the whole superficial area of the basilica.

but skirts pinned inward, and black silk aprons tortured into veils, will pass the scrutiny of the guard.

Just by one of the pillars of the dome, near the tomb of Peter, is an unsightly bronze statue of that Apostle, which antiquaries allege to be the statue of Jupiter from the Capitoline hill, the thunderbolt exchanged for keys. The faithful kiss the toe of this image and salute it with their foreheads. Is the religion of Rome changed but in name? Is not its Ecclesiasticism Paganized?

A long line of grenadiers now prepare the nave for the entrance of the procession. Rude soldiers thrust back the curious crowd. First comes the Swiss guard, in fantastic dress, with helmets and halberds; next ecclesiastics, two and two, some in black robes, some in red; next dignitaries in purple and gold, in scarlet and ermine, in white lace and purple; the triple crown — rich jewelled mitres — borne in State; the illuminated cross; the sword of State; the cardinals, in scarlet robes and stockings, with capes of white lace and gold, and mitres of white damask and silver; and, last of all, the Pope, arrayed in white satin trimmed with gold, wearing a tiara of jewels, seated in a crimson chair upon a platform borne on the shoulders of twelve men clothed in scarlet, beneath a canopy of white silk embroidered with silver. On each side of him is borne aloft an immense fan of peacock's feathers, a symbol that the eyes of the Pope are over all the earth. As the chair approaches, the soldiers present arms and fall upon their knees, while the people cast themselves to the ground to receive the passing benediction of the Holy Father.

On entering the choir, the Pope descends from his tottering elevation, knells before the altar, and is then conducted to the lower throne. The cardinals advance in order, and salute him by kissing his hand; then follow the bishops, who bow slowly before him to receive his blessing; and, after these, a lower order of ecclesiastics prostrate themselves at the footstool and kiss the extended toe of the right foot, as they just now kissed the toe of Peter's statue.¹ This homage to the supreme Pontiff consumes nearly an hour.

When at last it is over, the choir begin the chants for the day, and respond to the fine recitative of his Holiness. The mitre

¹ It is pretended that they kiss the cross on the slipper; but why is a cross embroidered on the toe of the slipper and this always extended for homage?

and the vestments of the Pope are changed with every transition in the service. At length he is led to the higher throne, whence he walks reverently to the high altar and consecrates the host. The music swells forth its loudest, sweetest strains; and, as he adoringly elevates the host and three times displays the jewelled chalice in sight of all the people, the silver trumpets sound a blast that quivers through the dome; the soldiers present arms and drop upon their knees, the cardinals kneel amid clouds of incense, and the people fall to the ground in awe of the mystic body and blood of the Lord. This is the culminating point of the worship of modern Rome. Is it Christian or Pagan? Mark now as the Pope descends from the altar, the *same* prostrations of soldiers, ecclesiastics and people, just now rendered to the incarnate Godhead, are repeated to him; and, instead of staying the idolatry as did Paul and Barnabas at Lystra, he accepts it graciously; and, resuming his throne, "he exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

Raised again upon his moving throne, the Pontiff is borne through the church to his palace, receiving homage and dispensing blessings on the way. Would you comprehend this pompous ceremonial? Go to *Thebes*, and there, in the sculptures of four thousand years ago, you see the king borne under a canopy upon men's shoulders, with the *stabella* waving upon either side;¹ you see the monarch descend and offer incense to the idol, and then resume his throne to receive incense, offerings and homage from the priests; you see almost the exact type of this Christian service at Rome in the Pagan ceremonies of Egypt. To complete the picture, look out on the piazza and see that gorgeous display of carriages and livery; carriages of crimson or of blue profusely decorated with gold, and furnished each with three or five footmen in scarlet cloaks and stockings of the costliest material. The State processions of the queen of England and the emperor of France, present nothing so brilliant as this show of the holy men of Rome going to and from their devotions at St. Peter's.

But while the cardinals and bishops thus roll in splendor, where meantime are the people? Few of the common people were seen in the church. Its area that would hold fifty thousand seemed almost bare. Soldiers, ecclesiastics, visitors were there,

¹ The Pope is the only sovereign who retains this symbol.

but where are the people? Just here, emerging from poverty-stricken streets to stare or scowl at the gaudy carriages of the cardinals. While every third man is a soldier or a priest; an equal proportion are malcontents and beggars.

But are none of the people devout? O yes; they were at the *Maggiore* last night to see the silver cradle; and now, if you go to the church on the Capitol, that stands upon the site of the temple of Jupiter,¹ you will see them in crowds; for there is the famous *Bambino*, a doll cut from olive-wood at Jerusalem, painted by Luke when the carver was asleep, and, after many miraculous adventures, dropped as from heaven into the convent adjoining this church. This doll works miraculous cures, and is often carried to the sick with solemn procession. Now it is dressed up with satin and jewels, and exhibited together with effigies of Joseph, Mary, and the shepherds, accompanied with the recitation by children of the pious drama of the nativity. Here are the people, and this is their religion.

Or we will enter this church of the Virgin near by. Here is a marble statue of Mary, the toe of which is worn by kissing; here are crowds of women on their knees awaiting their turn to draw near and kiss the sacred foot; the image is so laden with votive offerings, gold and silver hearts, chaplets of flowers, pictures, all manner of gewgaws, that you can hardly see its outline; while the pillars and walls are all glittering with offerings, among which are the crutches of cripples whom the statue has restored. Yes, here are the people, making their bows, saying their prayers, offering candles and other gifts, kneeling, bowing, kissing, crossing, counting their beads, or waiting for a drop of sacred healing oil from the cruse of the Virgin.

In the church of *San Teodoro* in the Forum, you will see mothers carrying sick children to be healed, just as the mothers of Pagan Rome brought their children to be healed at the temple of Romulus, near the fountain of *Juturna*, on that very spot. Indeed, so strong is the resemblance of the modern religion to the ancient, that a similarity of the rites of any church to those of an ancient temple, guides the antiquary, almost infallibly, to the site of that temple. In the Pantheon, which retains unchanged its Pagan form, you find a statue of the sybil, worshipped as the Virgin Mary.

¹ *Ara Cœli*.

At St. John Lateran, the oldest basilica of Rome, you see the poor people gazing reverently at the urn that contains the head of Peter; at the porphyry slab on which the lots were cast for the garments of our Lord; at two columns from Pilate's house; and at the table on which the last supper was celebrated; though, as we have seen the latter at Nazareth also, we would caution you not to be too credulous.

Here, too, you will see poor creatures toiling, on their hands and knees, up the stairs by which Jesus ascended to the judgment-hall of Pilate; twenty-eight steps of marble transported hither miraculously from Jerusalem for the convenience of the faithful. In the midst of the gorgeous ecclesiasticism around them, are not these poor people *Pagans*?

Christmas is followed by the Sabbath. The shops are open. The people are idling in the markets, or sunning themselves in the piazzas. The landlord, the vetturino, the laundress, who would not do anything for you yesterday, because it was a festival, now come to you with all sorts of business, because it is only Sunday. There is no aspect of religion in the streets. Where shall we find the Christian Sabbath? Not in ecclesiastical Rome made Pagan. In the private house of the American legation, under the flag of the United States, is the only meeting of Protestant Christians allowed within the walls of Rome. Here is an upper chamber, unadorned, fitted up with a plain pulpit and settees, in which some sixty persons are met to worship God. Nothing could be more simple than their service. They sing a hymn; the Scriptures are read in their native English; prayer is offered, and a man in citizen's dress, taking for his theme a verse of the Bible, delivers a brief and simple discourse upon faith in Christ as the alone medium of access to God. When the service is ended, the congregation disperse, with the exception of a few who are bound to each other by a peculiar tie. Before them is a table covered with a plain white cloth; which, when removed, exhibits a plate of bread and a cup of wine. After prayer, they partake of these, each and all alike in remembrance of their common Lord.

How wide the contrast between this scene and the High Mass at St. Peter's yesterday; both intended to commemorate Christ as the Saviour of mankind. There the Pope, the highest ecclesiastic in the world, the head of all spiritual dignity and power, robed in full pontificals of satin and gold, and crowned with a

mitre glittering with jewels, took from a rubied cup of gold the wafer he had transmuted into the body of Christ, and ate it alone, only the sacristan first tasting it to assure him against poison; and a military band announced with a flourish of trumpets the moment of consecration. Here a few persons, male and female, sitting side by side, pass from hand to hand a plate and a cup, that each may call to remembrance the body and the blood of Christ. Never was a mass more gorgeous; never was a communion more plain. The one was the height of the artistic and the ceremonial; the other the extreme of the simple and the spiritual.

On that day there were seen at Rome the types of three religions: the old Paganism in its surviving monuments; the gorgeous ceremonialism of St. Peter's; the simple faith of the upper chamber. The first two are one. The Pope represents Ecclesiasticism in its intensest form. The Bambino represents Paganism in its lowest grade. The one is borne upon men's shoulders in a damask chair; the other is borne upon men's shoulders in a silver cradle; and both receive the homage due to God alone.

We have seen how for two years Paul preached at Rome in his own hired house, and gained converts even from the household of Nero. Let him rise again from the scene of his martyrdom, and, in the old Forum, or by the new St. Peter's, or in the church built over his own body to glorify that martyrdom,¹ let him read aloud his own Epistle to the Romans, expounding the great doctrine of justification by faith; let him essay, in any house, to preach to *natives* of Rome the Christ he preached to their ancestors, and would no man forbid him? Before two days, his voice would be silenced in a deeper dungeon than that of the bloody and remorseless Nero, and all the refinements of secret cruelty would prolong the sacrifice of the victim, ready, as of old, to be offered for the joy and defence of the faith.

In all Rome Paul would not now find as many native believers, as he there found converts from heathenism in the infancy of the Gospel. For centuries the Papacy has had absolute control over one of the fairest portions of the globe. Enthroned in the ancient capital of learning, of art, and of political power; wielding the power of the State, the power of Art, and the wealth of

¹ The church of St. Paul without the walls is one of the most magnificent structures of Rome. It is particularly rich in mosaics.

ages, over a simple, pliant and poetic people; what fruits has it produced to the glory of God? Architecture, whose magnificence rivals the monuments of Pagan Rome; painting and statuary, that form a distinct school of art; ceremonials unsurpassed in the golden empire; and with these a squalid, beggared population, the most oppressive, the worst-managed government in the civilized world; and superstition and idolatry as frivolous and debasing as marked the worship of the old Pagan divinities. Where Paul preached, witnessed and suffered; where the noble army of martyrs, whose simple memorials are yet found in the catacombs, witnessed a good confession; where Christianity was at length inaugurated in the seat of empire and proclaimed the religion of the world; there the reader of the Bible is imprisoned and the preacher of the cross forbidden; there nothing but the presence of foreign flags hinders the persecution of all believers; there Ecclesiasticism rules supreme and enacts the rites of Paganism over its fallen shrines.

From Rome we pass to ATHENS, in the inverted order of Paul's missionary tour, and there study the phases of Christianity in the old and in the new. When Paul stood in the midst of Mars Hill, he was surrounded with the most glorious memories of Athenian history, the proudest schools of Athenian philosophy, and the most perfect models of Athenian art. "Nothing," says Wordsworth,¹ "could present a grander, and, if we may so speak, a more *picturesque* and *scenic* illustration of his subject than the objects with which he was surrounded. In this respect, Nature and Reality painted, at the time and on the spot, a nobler cartoon of Paul's preaching at Athens than the immortal Raphael has since. . . . Visible behind him, at no great distance, was the scene of Athenian glory, the island of Salamis." Nearer flowed the Cephissus, upon whose banks yet lingered the groves of the Academy. "Before him was the crowded city itself. In the city, immediately below him, was the circle of the Agora, planted with plane trees, adorned with statues of marble, bronze and gilded, with painted porticoes and stately edifices, monuments of Athenian gratitude and glory," so crowded with idols that it were easier to find there a god than a man; a little beyond was the Pnyx, fresh with the memories of Themistocles, Pericles and Demosthenes; "and, above all, towering to his left, rose the

¹ "Athens and Attica;" the most picturesque and eloquent description of ancient Athens.

stately Acropolis itself, faced with its Propylaea as a frontlet, and surmounted with the Parthenon as a crown. The temple of the Eumenides, with its sacred fountain, was immediately below him." Further on was the yet perfect Theseum, whose "solid yet graceful form looks as if it had been quarried, not from the bed of a rocky mountain but from the golden light of an Athenian sunset." The honeyed Hymettus towered upon the east, and the marble mass of Pentelicus to the north marked the adjacent site of Marathon. On the margin of the Ilyssus, and hidden by the Acropolis from Mars Hill, stood the yet unfinished temple of Olympian Jove, whose progress had marked the history of Athens for six hundred years, and whose columns were gone to grace the Capitoline hill before they had cast a completed image over the Ilyssus. Turning toward the Acropolis, he would see the beauteous votive temple of *Victory*, divested of her wings and sandals, that she might abide with the heroes of Marathon, Salamis and Plataea; the temple of *Minerva Polias*, that enclosed the sacred olive; and, "towering over the city from its pedestal on the rock of the Acropolis, the bronze colossus of Minerva, armed with spear, shield and helmet, as the Champion of Athens. Standing almost beneath its shade, he pronounced, that the Deity was not to be likened either to that, the work of Phidias, nor to other forms in gold, silver or stone, graven by art and man's device, which peopled the scene before him; and that God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands."

Laying now the map of the modern over the ancient, the grove of the Academy is a pleasure garden, the porches of the Epicureans and the Stoics are in ruins, the idols are no more; and the majestic Partheuon crumbles amid the ruins of a rude Venetian tower and the dismantled bastions of a Turkish fort. But, though the Pagan philosopher and the Mohammedan iconoclast are gone, a Pagan and persecuting Ecclesiasticism usurps the name of Christianity, and by its pompous ritual conceals that "unknown God" whom Paul declared. In the Byzantine chapels that have survived the Mohammedan rule, and in the yet unfinished Cathedral of Otho, you witness the adoration of an ignorant superstitious multitude to pictures of saints, and the sacrifice of the mass; you see the consecrated wafer administered to the infant of three months, already regenerate by baptism; and, while fasts

and festivals consume two-thirds of the working-days of the year, the Sabbath is desecrated by the royal head of the church for the review of his guards; and gardens and markets are opened for the gala. There, too, a Paganized Ecclesiasticism opposes, by fraud and by violence, the reading and the teaching of the Bible in the common tongue;¹ and denounces *Jonas* King as "an imp of the devil spewed upon the shores of Greece from the belly of hell." In the city where Paul proclaimed one supreme and spiritual Jehovah, the alone object of intelligent and believing worship, a Christian missionary is mobbed, stoned, imprisoned, and threatened with exile, for denying that *Mary* is fitly styled the mother of God, and entitled to religious veneration; and that a wafer is transformed into God by the incantations of a priest. *Mary* has usurped the place of *Minerva* in her own city; and, where the Epicurean and Stoic are forgotten, and the gorgeous idolatry of Greece lies in fragments, an ecclesiastical hierarchy, usurping the name of the church of Christ, and paganized in spirit and in worship, persecutes the faith that *Dionysius* the Areopagite received at the lips of Paul. And this same Greek Ecclesiasticism rules over fifty millions of souls; and, led by the autocrat of all the Russians, now threatens to overwhelm the freer constitution of the Turk, and to destroy the fruits of Christian missions throughout the eastern world.

Passing on from Athens to JERUSALEM, we there find this same Ecclesiasticism in a fourfold form, still paganized and persecuting, installed over the cross and the sepulchre of our Lord. No Sanhedrim now holds its midnight conclave against the prophet of Nazareth, or in open day incites the mob to the murder of Stephen. No cowardly Pilate condemns the innocent to be crucified. The scourge, the prison, and the cross are gone; but only because the Moslem,² not the ecclesiastic, holds the keys of Jerusalem. And even now, by subtlety, the ecclesiastic thwarts the missionary, and has driven him by violence from Bethlehem on the very festival of the birth of Christ. There is wanting only the political power of Pope or Czar, to revive in Jerusalem itself the persecutions of the martyr age. There *Paganized Ecclesiasticism*, Greek, Latin, Armenian, Copt, kisses

¹ Among the books lately seized and proscribed by the Greek ecclesiastics were several consisting entirely of selections from the Holy Scriptures.

² The good faith of the Turk, in his protectorate of the holy places, is worthy of all praise. The compact of Suludin is held inviolate.

the stone and kneels before the socket of the cross ; venerates images, pictures and relics ; worships the Virgin ; makes invocation to the saints ; adores the sacrifice of the Mass ; matches with frenzied zeal the vestal fire from the sepulchre ; dispenses its indulgences for sin ; exalts itself above all that is called God ; and flashes its impotent hate against the meek disciple of the meek and holy One.

The picture of the East as it is, overlying the picture of the East as it was, gives you the fact and the argument of our subject. Have we not justified to you by facts the assertion that, everywhere throughout the Eastern world, a Paganized Ecclesiasticism, centred in Rome and in Athens, and ramified over all Continental Europe and Western Asia, is now the grand antagonism of the Gospel ? Where the first missionaries from Antioch preached that Gospel to the subverting of the old idolatry, Ecclesiasticism has usurped the name of Christianity, and has restored the rites and offices, the very images and symbols of Paganism under the baptism of Christ and the symbol of his cross.

Whence comes this stupendous usurpation that has transformed the missionary Christianity of Antioch into the Paganized Ecclesiasticism of Rome, of Athens, and of Jerusalem ; that rules the consciences of two hundred millions of our race ; and that on every soil confronts the missionary with its subtle and deadly hostility ? What is the secret of its growth and strength ? How shall this antagonism, unknown to Barnabas and Paul, be met by those who shall follow in their track ? No question at this day is so important to a Society of Missionary Inquiry ; and if, by picturing the strength, the ubiquity, and the resources of this adversary, we shall stimulate your minds to grapple with this great question, the practical end of this argument will be attained.

How came it to pass, that the living Christianity that superseded a fossil Judaism, has itself been stiffened into an Ecclesiasticism more inflexible than that of chief priests and pharisees ; and the Christianity that subverted Paganism, has itself become paganized in its forms, its observances, and its spirit ? If we can trace the origin of this now monstrous perversion, we shall better understand its remedy.

I. The first cause of this change was the departure from the idea that the church of Christ, whether in its general or its local forms, is *a simple and an equal brotherhood of believers*. When

Christ appeared, the religious systems of the world were alike hierarchical in their structure and their administration. Whether through some common tradition, or by the urgency of universal guilt, expiatory sacrifices were the prominent feature of all religions. But for sacrifices there must needs be priests; and with the priesthood comes the idea of mediation; until at length a seeming divinity is attached to him who fulfils the office of reconciliation between man and God. The Jewish system had this feature by Divine institution, and by way of type. It had its high priest standing between Jehovah and the people. Pagan Rome had its altars, its priests, and its *Pontifex Maximus*. This lies in human nature, and in the nature of the case. When Christ came, he answered herein the universal want of the human soul. He was the complete and all-sufficient atonement for sin. He now is the one living and prevailing Mediator. Nothing remains for us as relates to ourselves, but to believe in Christ, and accept him as our atonement and priest; and nothing as relates to others, but to proclaim Christ as their Saviour. This is all that one can do under the Gospel: *believe in Christ for himself, and persuade others to believe in him also*. Christ abolished the law of commandments in ordinances, nailing it to his cross. But that law was not so easily abolished from the human heart. How long it was before the immediate disciples of Christ, with all the advantage of his daily teaching, could comprehend the spirituality of his mission, and see in him the fulfilment and the end of the ceremonial law. How large a portion of the Apostolic writings is given to the proof, that types and ceremonies, altars, priests and sacrifices are superseded by the atonement and mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ.

If Christ made an atonement for the world, no other can be needed; if Christ is Mediator, none other can be recognized or accepted. Hence in the first Christian Society there was one Lord and Master, even Christ, and a company of brethren. The common office and duty of these as disciples, was to make other disciples. No one was lord over the rest; no one had prerogatives higher than the rest; but all were brethren.¹ Such a community did not accord with the existing constitution of society, either political or religious. It was contrary to the edu-

¹ The utter silence of the Evangelists and the other Apostles as to the primacy of Peter, is proof that they did not regard the memorable saying of Christ: "Thou art Peter," etc., as investing him with such primacy.

cation and the habits of all mankind, to all hereditary opinions and usages. It gave no scope to ambition; it testified against castes and hierarchies; and, while it excited the jealousy and the enmity of the great, it failed to satisfy the love of prodigy, pomp and mystery in the ignorant and superstitious. Just here the crafty, the "conservative," and the compromising took advantage of the moral power of the new religion, and of the excitement it had produced, to bring in the old elements of the supernatural and the hierarchical under new forms. Judaizing teachers sought to enforce the observance of the Levitical law; while Pagan casuists, converted into Christian fathers, grafted upon the Gospel their speculative philosophy, together with such usages borrowed from heathenism as they deemed innocent, or as might serve to attract the multitude. In particular, the natural and world-wide notion of a priesthood, a sanctified order in the church, was thus grafted upon Christianity, and that door once opened, there was no limit to the usurpations of spiritual despotism.

By degrees the metropolitan pastor grew to the dignity of a diocesan over the pastors of dependant churches; and when, at length, the name "Christian" ceased to be a reproach and a signal for persecution, and close upon the bloody decrees of Diocletian and the cruel prescription of Galerius, came the *Labarum* of Constantine, consecrating the imperial banner with the symbol of the cross, and investing Christianity with the protection and the patronage of the State, it was natural that the temples and statues of the old idolatry should be baptized with new names; that Christian bishops, impatient to convert the tolerant emperor, should trace resemblances between his Apollo and their Christ; that the religious festivals that belonged to the national and social life, should put on a new dress; that the Saturnalia and the festival of the winter solstice should be transformed into Christmas;¹ and *Sun-day* and the Sabbath be made coincident; and that the bishop of Rome should make his position in the seat of imperial power an argument for ecclesiastical supremacy. Especially, when Constantine proclaimed Christianity the religion of the empire, and transferred his capital

¹ There is no trace of Christmas earlier than the third century. It is an offshoot of Pagan Rome. Vide Neander, Gieseler, Mosheim, and even Cave. Chrysostom argues for it as an appropriate festival, though of recent origin. Other fathers advocate it as a substitute for the Saturnalia.

from the Tiber to the Bosphorus, did the bishop of Rome seek to fortify himself against his eastern rival by the traditional supremacy of the mistress of the world. When the emperor crept out of the shell of authority that the incrustation of ages had formed about Rome, the Pope quietly crept in.¹

The hierarchical constitution of the Papacy rests upon the idea of priestly intercession as its chief corner-stone. Once admit that in the church of Christ there is a consecrated order, having official sanctity and prerogatives; that, there is in the Christian brotherhood any other distinction than that which superior talent, and practical wisdom, and high virtue must command — a superiority that is moral and personal, and not official — once create a priesthood, and the Pope is a logical necessity. You must have an apex to your pyramid. Many priests make diversity; these must have superiors, and these, other superiors, till you reach the culminating point of unity and sanctity in the chief priest or Pope.

Herein the Roman Catholic system is a unit; more complete than the Armenian or the Greek. It is the great granite pyramid of Cheops compared with the huge misshapen mounds of brick at Dashour.² This system is profoundly adapted to human nature, both logically and artistically. The artistic effect of High Mass in St. Peter's would be improved by abbreviating the homage, and by following the elevation of the Host immediately with the benediction. But even now, in its artistic points, it is the most gorgeous and imposing ceremonial in the world; and, given the premises that underlie it, it has also a fine religious effect. Yet all this pomp of ritual lies in the doctrine of a human priesthood as in a germ. "The idea," says Coleridge,³ "that the church meant the clergy — the hierarchy exclusively — constituted the first and fundamental apostasy." And Arnold⁴ declared: "the great cause of hinderance to the triumph of Christianity to be in the corruption not of the religion of Christ, but of the church of Christ." That church he defines to be, not an institution of the clergy, but a living society of all Christians. And he elsewhere says: "The laity is the church minus the clergy, as the people are the State minus the nobility and the

¹ This fine point, we believe, is original with Rev. Leonard Bacon, D. D. of New Haven, in his unpublished lectures on Church History and Polity.

² Known commonly as the false pyramids.

³ Aids to Reflection.

⁴ Life, by Stanley.

king; this is the view taken of the church in the New Testament, and between this and its opposite the difference is incalculable." That one difference makes the two extremes of our picture. Take away our simple faith in Christ as our atoning priest, and our respect and affection for all his disciples as our equals in the congregation of believers, and we must go to Rome to satisfy our conception of a consecrated order between man and God. Ecclesiasticism and evangelical faith cannot dwell in unison. He, therefore, who would successfully oppose the ecclesiasticism that overspreads the eastern world, must have no fellowship with its rudimental doctrine of a priesthood in the church of Christ.

II. A second source of this Paganized Ecclesiasticism is a false theology as to the nature of sin and of holiness, and the method by which a sinful character is changed into a holy character. Borrowing the sensuous philosophy of the old Paganism of the East, it makes sin lie, not in a state of will or in a voluntary state of the affections, but in an inherited vice of constitution, and in overt acts of greater or less turpitude. Hence the sinful essence and its putative sin must be counteracted by a putative sanctity conveyed through the sacraments of baptism and the Mass; and overt sins must be atoned for by a sliding scale of penances. Bodily mortifications and priestly manipulations must work over this vicious and depraved constitution. Given a depravity purely physical to be rectified by a physical regeneration, and the sacraments of the Greek and Roman churches are a logical necessity: and now, as before, the mind seeks for the highest impressiveness and the highest validity in the forms through which sanctification is dispensed, and in the power that grants it absolution.

He who would grapple with such a system, must rightly understand the nature of sin as "the transgression of the law;" and the nature of regeneration as an intelligent change from sin to holiness wrought in the mind itself, by obeying the truth through the Spirit. He must oppose to it something clearer, sharper, bolder, truer far, than the petrified formulas which a late prize writer¹ has set up against it clothed in the impenetrable mists of Scotch philosophy.

III. This system grows out of the substitution of the outward and the ceremonial in religion for the inward and the spiritual.

¹ Gault.

This is the natural and the universal tendency of man in a state of ignorance and corruption. The devotional sentiment, uneducated in the sublimity of that worship announced at Jacob's well, seeks expression through outward symbols, and these in turn react upon the devotional sentiment. Had you asked an intelligent Roman of the age of Augustus, why he worshipped the statue of Venus or kept the *Saturnalia*, he would have answered, that he did not pay his homage to the statue, but to the divinity whom it suggested to his thoughts; and that the *Saturnalia* was a joyous and grateful recognition of the life-giving principle in the earth; and, should you ask an intelligent Roman at this day, why he worships the statue of Mary and keeps the festival of Christmas, he would answer, that he does not worship the image, but the image helps his conception of the Virgin intercessor, and that Christmas is a joyful and grateful recognition of the life and redemption brought to the world through Christ. Yet the old Roman was an idolater. What, then, is the modern Roman? Just in proportion as the mind turns away from an intelligent, personal communion with God, and looks for religious emotion to the outward and the visible; just in proportion as religion is withdrawn from the sphere of the intellect, the will, the conscience, and the heart, into the exclusive sphere of the imagination; does idolatry enter, whether it be in the temple or in the church. A religion of ceremony tends logically to Paganism. It was from this side that Art, born of Beauty and Truth, but corrupted by alliance with Paganism, in turn corrupted Christianity through her own degeneracy. With the early Christian church, observes an able critic,¹ the Saviour was represented "not like the gods of the Pantheon, catching the eye by outward attractions, but conquering the heart by the power of his word. . . . Christianity repudiated every outward aid, which, by alluring the senses, was calculated to sully the purity of her office. . . . But the life and manners of Paganism had been too closely interwoven with artistic forms for the followers of the new faith entirely to disengage themselves from them." Accordingly, as Pagan art lost its representative character in the symbolical, Christianity appropriated its symbols for new ideas; and "Orpheus captivating the wild beasts of the forest by the sound of his lyre, appears very early as an emblem of Christ, and has in early frescoes a distinguished place with Moses and Elijah, with

¹ Kugler, *Handbook of Painting for Italy*; edited by Eastlake.

Peter and John; while in mosaics of the baptism of Christ, in addition to the figures of the Saviour and the Baptist, the river Jordan is represented under the figure of a river-god rising out of the water to wait upon our Lord; an easy interblending of the Pagan with the Christian, though cherished conventional forms of art.

Thus as Justinian brought to the building of St. Sophia, in Constantinople, which he boasted more glorious than Solomon's temple, pillars of porphyry from the temple of the Sun at Baalbec; of granite from the demolished temple of Serapis in Egypt, and of *verd antique* from the temple of Diana at Ephesus, so was the whole Pagan world made tributary to the system of faith and of worship for which St. Sophia was erected; the sacred prestige of hierarchy, the metaphysical subtleties of doctrine, the pomp of ceremony, the embellishments of art, all wrought into one stupendous system that overawes the hundred millions of mankind.

The missionary who would successfully encounter such a system, must oppose to it, both in his teachings and in his life, the simple, severe, sublime spirituality of the Gospel. With all charity for the individual votaries of the system, he must on no account fraternize or compound with the system itself. His office is neither to reform the system nor aggressively to subvert it; but to *evangelize* the people, to convert individual souls to Christ, leaving to God the issue of schism and of overthrow. To priestly sanctity he must oppose a humble spiritual life; to priestly incantations the simple preaching of the Gospel; to the symbols of art, the truths of doctrine and the virtues of obedience; to the organism of hierarchy, the equal fraternity of believers; to ceremonialism, faith; to ecclesiasticism, Christ. In the person and the teachings of the missionary, the theology of Jacob's well goes forth alike against Jerusalem and Gerizim; against Mecca, Athens and Rome. And he who sat on Jacob's well goes with it in the power of an endless life. In the power of that life the cause of missions stands, and by that power it shall prevail. Every adversary shall be slain by the word of his mouth. As Pharisaism and Paganism have perished from the track of Christ and his Apostles, so shall this *Paganized Ecclesiasticism* perish from the track of the missionary of the cross.

Courage, then, ye who would bear that standard back where first it floated on the shores of the Great Sea. Let not the

desolation of Antioch, the vassalage of Jerusalem, the drivelling superstitions of Athens, the apostasy of Rome, shed over you the blight of despondency, as if Paul himself had labored in vain and the work of missions had proved a failure. It was meet that the Mystery of Iniquity should work upon the grandest scale that it might work itself out for all time, and thus, amid the woes and execrations of the world, work out its own destruction. This long apostasy but paves the way for your speedier success. Fear not to meet it with the simple preaching of the Word. For thus shall that Wicked be *revealed* in his true character of deceit and infamy, "WHOM THE LORD SHALL CONSUME WITH THE SPIRIT OF HIS MOUTH, AND SHALL DESTROY WITH THE BRIGHTNESS OF HIS COMING."

ARTICLE VI.

NOTES UPON THE GEOGRAPHY OF MACEDONIA.

By Rev. Edward M. Dodd.

THE region about the head of the Sinus Thermaicus, embracing a portion of Thessaly, is both sacred and classic ground. There was situated Thessalonica and Berea, and there are Olympus and the Vale of Tempe.

Thessalonica was originally called Thermae (whence *Sinus Thermaicus*), afterwards Thessalonica, and now Selanik by the Turks, Salonique by the French, Salonieco by the Italians, Salonica by the English, and still Thessalonica by intelligent Greeks and by the missionaries.

It is situated at the head of the Gulf of Salonica (*Sinus Thermaicus*) on the north north-eastern shore, upon the slope of a range of hills rising from the sea-shore, its lower walls washed by the waves, and its Acropolis crowning the hill-top. Thus situated, it presents a striking appearance from the sea, surrounded with its white-washed walls, displaying its domes and minarets, and enclosed on either side by its vast burial places.

It has at present a population variously estimated at from 60,000 to 80,000; of these one half are Jews; a few, of almost all other nations under heaven, and the remainder, half Greeks and half Turks.

There can be no doubt that this site of the city has remained unchanged from the apostles' day, and, indeed, much longer. While the upper part of

the walls in many places consists of Turkish repairs, the lower tiers of masonry show the large hewn and bevelled stones of ancient times. The chief street even, passing between the two chief gates on opposite sides of the city, is unchanged, for there remains two triumphal arches of Roman work, which span it, one near its gate. Few eastern cities have so many ecclesiastical remains as Thessalonica. All of the principal mosques were formerly Greek churches; and at least two of them were originally Pagan temples, converted into churches on the introduction of Christianity, and to mosques at the Turkish conquest. Their form and masonry prove this. One of these is called *Eski Metropoli* (the old Metropolitan), a mixture of Turkish and Greek not uncommon there. A sketch of it may be seen in the *Missionary Herald* for July, 1836. It is a rotunda; its inner diameter eighty feet, the walls eighteen feet thick below (perhaps hollow), and fifty feet high. The upper part of the walls and the dome may have been added by Christians, but there can be no doubt that the main building is older. M. Cousinery considers it a temple of the Cabiri, whose rites were of Phœnician origin. Within, the dome and niches are adorned with representations of saints, animals, etc., in Mosaic and Greek inscriptions to explain them. This, of course, was a Christian addition. The Turks have not destroyed these figures as they often do.

In the yard of this mosque stands another curiosity of no little interest. It is one of the ancient pulpits or *βήματα*, cut from a solid block of white marble, with several steps cut in it to ascend it. It is much broken and defaced, though the sculptures upon it are in good taste.

Another of these ancient Pagan temples, which became a Christian church, and afterwards a mosque, is called *Eski Djuma* (Old Friday).

Among the most interesting of those built since the Christian era, is the mosque of Sophia, very similar in architecture to St. Sophia at Constantinople, and said by the Greeks to be built by the same architect. Its name indicates that it was a church dedicated to the Divine wisdom. Here, also, contrary to the usual custom of Turks, the figures in Mosaic of saints and palm-trees, and the Greek inscriptions, remain undestroyed. They contrast strongly with the simplicity and barrenness of Turkish worship. Here is another of the ancient pulpits, not like that at *Eski Metropoli*, turned out of doors, but in a conspicuous position in the mosque. It is cut from a solid block of *verd antique*, and is much more perfect than the other, though plainer. To add to its interest, the Greeks tell you that St. Paul preached from it!

This mosque, and the surrounding yard, are much lower than the street on either side. You ascend a slightly inclined plane to the principal gateway, which is quite massive, but of a height altogether disproportionately low. It is evident from the girth of the pilasters, that they must have been twenty-five or thirty feet high, but they are now only about ten. The conclusion is irresistible, taken with other appearances, that the street has gradually been raised by accumulations of rubbish fifteen or twenty feet, and thus

buried the lower part of this gateway. The same thing strikes one in many other parts of the city. In digging down for any purpose, almost anywhere, one must pass through ten or twenty feet of rubbish. When we know that the houses are either built of stone, or oftener of frame-work, filled in with soft bricks and mud, and that they do not stand many years, we may easily suppose that the whole city stands on a crust, twenty feet deep, of the ruins of former generations.

Thessalonica is supplied with water from Mt. Khortiateh, about fourteen miles distant. The aqueduct is evidently a Roman work. It starts from a reservoir on the side of the mountains, crosses a deep valley, at an elevation of one hundred feet, by an arched bridge of Roman architecture, winds along the ridge to the Acropolis, whence it flows in many channels through the city. Unlike our supplies of water, it is owned, as joint stock, by the principal inhabitants. There is no distributing reservoir, but the stream as it flows is divided by passing through small tubes into as many smaller streams as there are shares; and each share-holder receives his portion by his own pipe, in a continual stream, into his private reservoir in his own garden.

The broken fragments of ancient architecture throughout the city are countless; broken shafts and columns, capitals and entablatures, meet you on every hand, in every part, and put to almost every conceivable use. Door-steps, gate lintels, butchers' counters, bakers' kneading boards, are made of them; huge entablatures are scooped out for watering troughs; Ionic vases are hollowed out for well-curbs; the walls of the houses and of the city are garnished with them; and, finally, multitudes of shafts and columns are used as head-stones in the Mohammedan graveyard.

As one stands on the rising ground in the upper part of the city, an imposing prospect presents itself before him. Fourteen miles to the east rises Mt. Khortiateh, a double peak of some height. To the south, the gulf lies spread out before him, and across it, on the south-western shore, towers Mt. Olympus, seeming to rise out of the water eight or ten miles distant, though really fifty miles off, and its summit five miles inland. It is a massive and majestic mountain, and continually in sight, from base to summit, from our windows; it seemed to exert a solemn, quieting influence upon our spirits. It spoke to us of the Unchangeable, in our hours of gloom. From Olympus itself there shoots off, north north-west, the Olympian range, at the foot of one of whose peaks, Mt. Bumius, stands Berea, about forty-five miles west of us. South of Berea, a short spur, or a series of hills, shoots off from the range toward us, nearly to the gulf.

Bounded on the south by these hills and the gulf, on the west by the Olympian range behind Berea, and north by other hills, stretches a great plain, even to the gates of Thessalonica, narrowing as it approaches there to a few miles. Across this plain lay Paul's route to Berea, when driven from Thessalonica. Let us follow in his path, and trace his steps. The land about the head of the gulf, west of the city, is low and marshy; and the whole plain, for twenty or thirty miles, is but little above the sea-level,

impregnated with salt, often, indeed, white with saline incrustations, and, of course, very barren. The traveller now must keep well away from the shore, to avoid the marshes. Unless the country has changed materially, Paul did so, crossed the Echidorus, now called the Gallic, about seven miles from the city gates, and the Axios, now called the Vardar, about six miles further, and eight miles from its mouth, and, about five miles beyond that, the Lydias, now called the Karasmak, the outlet of lake Pella, and now emptying into the Vardar, though anciently having its own channel to the sea. From the ferry of the Karasmak, the road continues about thirteen miles in a south-west direction, to the ferry of the Judge Kara Su, the ancient Haliacmon; this ferry is twelve miles from the mouth of that river, and west of the gulf. Up to this point the road from Thessalonica to Berea, and that from Thessalonica southward to Athens, are identical. At this point they diverge, the former continuing westward, on the north side of the Haliacmon, and the latter crossing the river and proceeding southward. Travelers from Berea southward toward Athens also pass this point, following the Thessalonica road as far as here, and then crossing the river on the southern road. This is a point of some interest, to which we shall again refer. From here, Thessalonica is thirty miles east north-east, and Berea sixteen miles west.

The soil, from the Karasmak westward to Berea, is better than toward Thessalonica, being higher above the sea. As we approach Berea (now called Kara Verria), we enter extensive and well watered gardens, at the foot of the mountain, and, passing through them, we ascend the first shelf of the hill, and enter the city, which stands upon a small bit of table-land, a kind of niche in the mountain. The city is compactly built of a kind of porous stone, easily hewn. Through all the principal streets, and many of the better class of houses, flow streams of pure water from the mountain, which, after watering the gardens below, flow away in two streams in opposite directions along the base of the mountain, the one to the Haliacmon and the other to the Lydias.

Berea has at present a population of six thousand; about two hundred Jews, fifteen hundred Turks, and the remainder Greeks. They have one synagogue, twelve mosques, and sixty Greek churches.

We have no account in Acts of the church at Berea, but it is evident from the narrative that the company of believers was not small. Not being a place of importance, like Thessalonica, there was no such occasion for the mention of it afterward. After Paul left the city, Timothy and Silas remained for some time, till sent for to follow Paul to Athens.

What route did Paul take from Berea to Athens? This has occasioned no little discussion from the expression used in Acts 17: 14: "Sent away Paul to go as *it were* to the sea," "and they that conducted Paul, brought him to Athens." Is a feint or trick intended in the words *ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν*? Did he go to Athens by water? If so, why the use of *ὡς*?

Without any attempt at criticism or explanation direct of the text, we

will say a little of the geography of the region, and the routes from Berea southward, which may throw some light upon it.

Berea is situated upon the eastern slope of the Olympian range, which has a general south south-eastern course, till it runs out to the sea at Mt. Ossa. From Berea, near the base of the range, spreads out eastward a great plain reaching to Thessalonica, forty-five miles. This plain is bounded on the south by the gulf, and by a spur which runs out from the range south of Berea, extending nearly to the gulf. A traveller from Berea southward would, in all ordinary cases, take the road to Thessalonica, smooth and easy over the plain, until he reached the ferry of the Haliacmon, some ten or twelve miles from the sea; here he would take the road from Thessalonica toward Athens, which crosses the river at this point, and proceed nearly southward, having passed around the spur and lower summits of the Olympian range, and having a pleasant smooth road along the sea-shore to Tempe, and thence along the banks of the Peneus to Larissa.

The only other route from Berea southward, now travelled, is that which we took for the sake of curiosity and variety, in opposition to the advice of our guides, ascending Mt. Bumius behind Berea, and travelling for three days through the wildest, rudest scenery, and over the roughest and most precipitous road we ever passed. It is not probable that Paul took this route, when the other was so much smoother. No travellers do now, unless they have special reasons.

Whether, when Paul reached Dium, on the sea (probably the present Malathria), he took ship to Athens, or continued his journey by land, we cannot certainly determine, nor does it matter so much. He must have gone to the sea in either case.

An enlarged map of this region, which we have prepared with some care, partly from official surveys, and partly from our own recorded observations, may be seen in Mr. Newcomb's "*Cyclopaedia of Missions*," about to be published (under "THESSALONICA"). It will help to illustrate these points, and is more accurate than any published map of the region.

We took the mountain route from Berea to Larissa, intending to return by the other, and thus make the circuit of Olympus. After three days' ride through the mountains, we emerged, on the fourth day, into the plain of Larissa, drained by the Peneus. It was quite refreshing, after so long a mountain journey, to look upon the smooth green meadows and far-spreading vineyards, through which the gentle Peneus leisurely pursued its way to the sea. We reached Larissa at the end of the fourth day. It is situated upon the Peneus, some twenty miles or more from its mouth. It contains twenty or thirty thousand inhabitants, of whom perhaps two thousand are Jews, five thousand Turks, and fifteen or twenty thousand Greeks. It is the seat of a pashalik. From it Mt. Ossa appears distant twenty miles to the north-east, and Olympus forty miles north.

Leaving Larissa, we rode five hours across the plain, north north-east, and entered the gorge of Tempe, between Ossa and the lower summits of Olym-

pus, through which flows the Peneus. We were two hours passing through it. The precipices rose so abrupt on either side from the river's bank, that, much of the way, the path, a remnant of the old Roman road, was dug from the rock or partly climbed the precipice, and seldom was there more than room for the river and the road; at several points large streams of clear green water gushed out suddenly from under the precipice, crossed the road and emptied themselves into the muddy Peneus, full-grown brooks but six feet long.

After emerging from the gorge, we stopped at a khan by the river's side, to sleep in the *Vale of Tempe*. Some few travellers assign this classic name to the plain of Larissa, within the gorge; but that plain is too large and undefined. This valley, in which we slept, is really a continuation of the gorge. Olympus and Ossa recede from each other, and the Peneus, before hemmed in between their precipices, now flows on gently to the sea. The vale may be considered as having an average breadth of five miles between Olympus and the sea, and a length of ten miles from Ossa to where the sea comes in to bathe the feet of Olympus. The nearer of the two summits of Olympus is, perhaps, twelve miles north of the gorge, but his lower shelves overhang it.

As we proceed northward through the vale, we reach the ancient Platamona, eight miles north of the mouth of the Peneus, on the shore of the sea, where we may consider the vale as terminating, for here the ascent of Olympus begins from the shore.

Ten miles further north, we come to Malathria, another port, probably the ancient Dium. Either here or at Katerina (*Haterra*, perhaps, in ancient maps), five miles further north, Paul must have embarked, if he went by sea to Athens; and, if he went by land, he passed through both places, and through the gorge of Tempe to Larissa.

Katerina is twenty-five miles south-east of the Ilialiacmon ferry, forty miles from Berea, and more than thirty from Thessalonica. It is ten miles north of the chief peak of Olympus, though at the foot of the mountain. From here we rode northward, through a beautiful undulating country, nearly a plain, till, at the ferry of the Ilialiacmon, we struck into the road from Berea to Thessalonica, and had completed the circuit of Olympus.

The missionary aspects of this tour we have not referred to, as not belonging to our object here.

The inaccuracies of Butler's ancient map of this region are very gross. Indeed, the map seems little more than guess-work. The outlines of the gulf are quite wrong, though it is possible that the coast may have changed that much. Every river is misplaced; the course of some of them, especially near their mouths, may have changed, but not enough to account for the discrepancy, unless earthquakes have torn up the surface, and mountains been moved about like chess-men.

The Lydias now empties into the Axios. He represents the Astræus as emptying into the Lydias. It is more probable that the Astræus was an-

other name for the Haliaemon, now called sometimes Vistritza or Oistritza, perhaps Astræus, with a Bulgarian (Slavonic) termination. There is no such large river emptying now into the Lydias, as he represents the Astræus. The Haliaemon he makes empty into the gulf twenty-five miles south of its present mouth, near the head of the gulf. It could only have done this by crossing the Olympian range. It turns north on meeting that range, and breaks through them by a gorge near Berea. He places Olympus, Tempe, Ossa, and all, twenty miles too far south. Similar errors are numerous.

ARTICLE VII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

I. COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY.¹

WE are enabled to state, by means of these and some other writings of the same author, the specific bearings of comparative philology in the study of the Latin and Greek languages.

This science has shown the Greek and Latin languages to be, not original languages, but only two members of a large fraternity of languages, called the *Indo-European*. This whole family has a general resemblance, not only in the roots, but in phonetic principles, derivation, declension, conjugation, etc. Of course, the leading traits of the Greek and Latin languages, and, by analogy, the leading features of Greek and Latin mythology, etc., did not originate on classic soil, but are to be traced back to an original seat or common locality.

It has shown that the Latin is not a daughter of the Greek generally, nor of the Æolic in particular, and that the Greek and Latin are not derived from a common Pelasgian; but that the Greek and Latin are sisters of a wider fraternity. This modifies much of the reasoning in common grammars.

It has shown that the Latin is not a mixed language, composed of elements radically distinct. The materials of which it is composed, were evidently of one family.

¹ *Die Sprachvergleichung in ihrem Verhältniss zur classischen Philologie dargestellt*, von Georg. Curtius. II. Aufl. Berlin, 1848.

Die vergleichende Sprachforschung in ihrer neuesten Gestaltung, von Georg. Curtius, in *Allg. Monatsschrift für Wissensch. und Liter.* Jan. 1853.

It has illustrated in many ways the principles of Greek and Latin grammar.

1. It has thrown light on the *phonology* of the classic languages. The articulate sounds of Greek and Latin had previously attracted but little attention. Comparative philology has either discovered or given prominence to three modes of strengthening sounds; viz.

(1) By *guna* (a term derived from the Sanskrit), which consists in prefixing the *a* sound to the vowels *i* and *u*; as, radical $\pi\iota\theta$, whence $\pi\iota\theta\omega$; rad. $\varphi\upsilon\gamma$, whence $\varphi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omega$. The distinction between *Guna* and *Vridhhi* does not appear in Latin and Greek.

(2) By *nasalizing* of vowel sound; as, rad. $\lambda\beta$, whence $\lambda\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$; rad. $\lambda\alpha\theta$, whence $\lambda\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$; rad. $\lambda\alpha\chi$, whence $\lambda\alpha\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$; Lat. rad. *rup*, whence *rumpo*; rad. *fud*, whence *fundo*; rad. *frag*, whence *frango*.

(3) By *reduplication*; as, rad. $\theta\tau$, whence $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\mu\iota$; rad. $\gamma\upsilon\upsilon$, whence $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$; Lat. rad. *gen*, whence *gigno*.

These processes throw light on various forms of the Greek and Latin verbs.

2. This science has thrown light on Greek *euphony*, as exhibited in diversifying the *a* sound of the Sanskrit; as, Gr. $\epsilon\varphi\epsilon\rho\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, comp. Sansk. *abharam*; $\epsilon\varphi\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, comp. Sansk. *abharāmaha*; $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\alpha$, comp. Sansk. *gagana*; also $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota$.

3. This science has thrown light on the *declension* of classic nouns.

(1) It distinguished the crude-form, as $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron$, from the root or stem on one side, rad. $\lambda\epsilon\gamma$, and the nominative or ground-form on the other, $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. This doctrine of the crude-form is derived from the native Sanskrit grammarians.

(2) It distinguishes between *σ* or *s*, the sign or exponent of the nominative case, as, Gr. $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, Lat. *lupus*, and *σ* or *s*, which is merely formative, as, Gr. $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, gen. $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (for $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, comp. Sansk. *manasas*); Lat. *genus*, gen. *gen\acute{e}ris*.

(3) It has shown that the proper vocative case, as we should expect, is an abridged or mutilated form, not of the nominative, but of the crude-form. This is shown both by the form of the vocative and by the accent. The use of the nominative for the vocative is a distinct and abnormal usage.

(4) It illustrates the relation of the Sanskrit, Greek and Latin imparisyllabic declension; as,

Sansk.	$gn\acute{\alpha}tas$,	$gn\acute{\alpha}t\acute{\alpha}$,	$gn\acute{\alpha}tam$;
Greek.	$\gamma\nu\omega\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$,	$\gamma\nu\omega\tau\acute{\eta}$,	$\gamma\nu\omega\tau\acute{\omicron}\acute{\omicron}\nu$;
Latin,	(<i>g</i>) <i>notus</i> ,	(<i>g</i>) <i>nota</i> ,	(<i>g</i>) <i>notum</i> .

The Sanskrit depends, for the distinction of gender, on the difference of quantity, and for the cases, on the suffix syllables; the Greek depends on the change of vowels and has more of it. The Latin follows the Greek for the most part.

It is somewhat different with the imparisyllabic declension.

(5) It has discovered the remains of a locative case, and of an instrumental case in Latin, and also shown the union of two cases in one.

These things are important.

4. This science has illustrated the *conjugation* of the classic verb, by showing

(1) That the personal terminations of the verbs are fragments of personal pronouns.

(2) That the conjugation in μ , as Buttmann suspected, is the most ancient.

(3) That the first Perfect (so called) is merely a variety of the second Perfect, formed by aspiration.

(4) That the Future is a compound tense (not formed from the apod. subjunctive); but of a distinct origin, and nearly related to the optative of the substantive verb.

(5) That the passive has developed itself from the middle.

(6) That the infinitive is the case of a noun.

These things have an important bearing on the inflection of the Greek and Latin verb.

5. This science has thrown light on certain *adverbs*. It has shown the Greek *εἰς* and Latin *facillime*, to be ancient ablative cases.

6. It has thrown light on certain *particles*; as, *ye*, comp. Sansk. *gā*; *ay*, comp. Sansk. *kam*; *εἰ*, comp. Sansk. *yat*.

7. This science has thrown light on the *formation or derivation* of words.

(1) It has shown the connection of the Gr. suffix $\mu\epsilon\rho$ (in *ἀνθρωπος*, *ἄνθρωπος*) and Lat. *men* (in *nomen*, *mens*), by comparing *θεῖος* and *θεογενής*, *καλός* and *καλοπαιδής*. The *v* lost in the suffix $\mu\epsilon\rho$ exhibits itself in the derivatives verb and adjective.

(2) Also the connection of the Greek suffix *ος* and the Lat. suffix *itis* (to which latter a second suffix has been attached), by the intermediate form *itis* in Gr. *πικρός*, Lat. *pestis*.

(3) Also the connection of *λέων* and *λέων*, *φῶς* and *εὐφάν*, by observing the development of Greek vowels, *e*, *o*, *α*, from Sanskrit *a*.

(4) Also the connection of *-ος*, *-μα*, *-ες*, in the declension of participles, by comparing Sansk. *vas*, *ushi*.

8. This science has thrown light on the *syntax* of the classic languages, by exhibiting the original force of the case-relations, the distinction of the modes, the nature of the gerundives; topics which must be studied in the languages combined, and not separately, if we would arrive at just conclusions.

9. This science has thrown light on the Greek *dialects*. Compare what Giese and Ahrens have done in this province with the dry and meagre collections of a Maittaire. Dialectic variation is entirely distinct from the derivation or formation of words.

10. This science throws light on the *prosody or accentuation* of the classic languages. This was not to be expected, but the process has been as follows:

(1) Some remarkable accordances between Sanskrit and Greek accentuation were discovered. Besides insulated examples,

Comp. Gr. *δαίς*, representing a class of Greek adjectives in *ος*, with Sansk. *daśús*, representing also a class in Sanskrit, both oxytones.

Comp. Gr. *δράκ* and other nouns in *ράς*, with Sansk. *dhānds* and other nouns in *nds*, all oxytones.

Comp. Gr. nom. *ναῦς*, gen. *νήε* (*naûs*), acc. *νήα*, with Sansk. nom. *ndus*, gen. *navds*, acc. *ndram*.

Comp. Gr. *αἰσός* and other adjectives in *ός*, with Sansk. *ptvards* and other adjectives in *rás*, all oxytones.

Comp. Gr. *πῆρ*, *ῖρ*, *ῑρ*, *ῑν*, with Sansk. *pāndan*, *capān*, *diṣan*.

2. It was observed that the vocative, as we should expect, followed the accent of the crude-form or stem of the word, and not of the nominative; as, nom. *Θεός*, voc. *Θεέ*.

3. It was then perceived that the crude-form, and not the nominative, guided the accentuation, as a general rule; as, masc. *βῆρ*, neut. *βῆρ*; *ῖος*, neut. *ῖος*; *ῑδμῖν*, neut. *ῑδμῖν*; *πρῶτος*, fem. *πρῶτος*.

4. It was also noticed that the accent was influenced by an earlier form of the word, which was discoverable only by comparative philology; as, *ῑν* (orig. *ῑν*); *ῑν* (orig. *ῑν*); Dor. *ῑν* (orig. *ῑν*).

11. This science, by separating what is common to all the languages of the class, enables us to see what is peculiar to each.

Thus in reference to *phonology*, the Sanskrit has three vowels and four diphthongs. The Greek has a greater variety of vowels and more flexibility. The Latin is deficient in diphthongs and is less flexible. The Teutonic exceeds in its diphthongs.

In respect to *composition*, the Sanskrit is extravagant, the Greek rich, and the Latin poor.

The Greek is more *euphonic*, from the variety which it has given to the Sanskrit *a*.

The Greek language abounds in *modes* more than the Sanskrit and Latin. G.

II. ALFORD'S GREEK TESTAMENT, VOL. I. SECOND EDITION.¹

WE have already noticed the second volume of this elaborate work, and we have recently, with great pleasure, examined the second edition of the first volume. The full title, given in the note, is quite an accurate description of the book.

The critically revised text has been most carefully studied, and is correctly and beautifully printed. It is a page on which the eye can rest with pleasure.

¹ The Greek Testament, with a critically revised text, a digest of various readings, marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage, prolegomena, and a critical and exegetical commentary, for the use of theological students and ministers, by Henry Alford, B. D., Minister of Luebeck Chapel, London, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In three volumes. Vol. I. Containing the Four Gospels. Second edition. London: Rivingtons, Waterloo Place. 1854. 8vo. pp. 935.

sure. The text is formed mainly on the basis of Tischendorf; and the author has carefully availed himself of all the more recent investigations in this important branch of Biblical science; and we may consider the text of the New Testament as now very nearly settled, and on a permanent foundation. Probably there will be hereafter few, if any, important departures from the text here exhibited.

The digest of various readings is better than any that has been heretofore published, not even excepting Tischendorf's. It is printed in a manner very agreeable to the eye and of easy comprehension, and for all practical purposes may be considered as very nearly a complete history of the text and its variations. It is most instructive to examine it, page after page, and observe the character and the amount of the variations, and the causes which have probably led to them. Such an exercise tends greatly to increase our confidence in the substantial correctness and certainty of our New Testament text.

The marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage are copious, judicious, satisfactory, and so arranged as to be easily available, without perplexity or loss of time.

The prolegomena are condensed, brief, and highly instructive. In plain and simple language they state what the reader most needs to know before proceeding to the critical study of the sacred books.

The critical and exegetical commentary of course will not always command entire acquiescence. The writer has availed himself, with very great diligence, of all the recent and best critical works. Though a presbyter of the church of England, he is not afraid to explore thoroughly the ocean of German criticism, and bring away and freely use whatever may be of value for his purpose. He is also quite familiar with the exegesis of the church fathers, and frequently introduces their commentaries with great point and effect. The fathers are by no means always right, nor can they, any more than other critics, be implicitly trusted; but they are sometimes right where the moderns are wrong; and there is, in the general tone of their exegesis, a simplicity and piety well worthy of imitation. The reformers, also, are frequently quoted and in other ways referred to. No one can carefully read the notes, in connection with the text, without receiving much instruction, and many valuable suggestions.

For theological students and ministers we consider this, on the whole, the most valuable Testament extant; and laymen, who take an interest in religious studies and can read Greek, would find this work a most agreeable and instructive companion of their leisure hours. We wish it might come into general use, but we fear that the high price will prove a very serious obstacle.

We by no means accord with all the conclusions of the author, whether in the text, digest, references, prolegomena, or commentary; nor do we expect that any human writer will be able to make a perfect book, especially where there is such a variety of topics, and many of them attended with so

much difficulty, as in a full critical development of the text and meaning of the New Testament. Still, this edition of the Greek Testament is a great work, highly creditable to the industry and skill of our British brother, and even more welcome to us, as one of the auspicious signs of the times, than if it had come from any of our Teutonic cousins.

III. BENECKE ON ROMANS.¹

THIS is a handsome translation of a valuable commentary. The English version of the Epistle itself is particularly valuable, and among the best which the language affords. The original commentary was published in Germany in the year 1831. The author, though a finished scholar, was not a theologian, but a merchant and a distinguished writer on mercantile law. His own religious wants and aspirations led him to a critical study of the Bible, and his solicitude in training a son for the ministry, brought him to a special examination of the Epistle to the Romans. The commentary throughout, therefore, has a practical character, and appeals especially to the religious experience of men. It is quite refreshing, after being surfeited with cold, unbelieving, irreligious criticism, to take up a work as warmly and zealously Christian as this.

The author fully adopts the view of preëxistence, substantially the same as that of Dr. Edward Beecher, and very zealously defends it. Many of his expositions, especially that of the fifth chapter, are entirely controlled by this dogmatic idea, and are, therefore, of less value, in a critical point of view, than they would otherwise have been. We can, however, with a good conscience, recommend the book to all lovers of the Bible, as a work full of interest and richly instructive. Commentaries on the great Epistle of the great Apostle are already very numerous, and still there is scope for more; for as yet the heights have not all been reached, nor the depths sounded, nor the intricacies unfolded. Each one can do but little, and it is only by combining the results of many labors, that any considerable advancement can be achieved. Great progress has already been made, and there will be room for more, for a long time to come. The student never need think his labor superfluous or his time misspent, in a strong effort *de novo* on the Epistle to the Romans.

¹ An Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, by William Benecke. Translated from the German. London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans. 1854. 8vo. pp. 459.

IV. THOLUCK'S SIN AND THE PROPITIATOR.¹

THIS translation of Tholuck's celebrated volume appeared in 1836 in England. The First Part of the volume was once translated for the American Biblical Repository, and was published in the eighth volume of that periodical. The whole volume is now published for the first time in this country. It has appeared in several editions in Germany. It was first published there in 1823, when its author was twenty-four years of age. It was designed to counteract the influence of De Wette's "*Theodore, or the Consecration of the Sceptic*," which was published in 1822. This volume of Tholuck's is characterized by his wonted affluence of learning, his deep religious feeling, and his freshness and originality of thought. Many paragraphs of the work seem to have had a prophetic meaning; and, when compared with the present state of evangelical religion in Germany, they illustrate the accuracy of the author's foresight. The volume has a deep historical interest, as it illustrates several phases of the modern German theology, and the personal experiences of several eminent scholars and philanthropists.

V. DR. JOHN PYE SMITH'S THEOLOGY.²

THIS work exhibits an extensive acquaintance with theological literature; with the writings of the Fathers, the Reformers, the more recent German, English and American divines. It is characterized by learning, more than by profound reasoning; and by a learning which is various and discursive rather than exact and full. It abounds with valuable thoughts, rich hints, and important references. It repays a careful study.

In his theological speculations, Dr. Smith adopts the old phraseology, although he often rejects the meaning originally attached to the ancient terms. He evinces an earnest and childlike desire to learn the truth, and to comply with the spirit of Augustine's maxim, inserted in the title-page of Dr. Smith's System: "*Cedat consuetudo veritati*." His mind has been evidently under the influence of the New England Divinity. For its advocates he has been wont to express a profound regard. Had he lived to

¹ Guido and Julius, or, Sin and the Propitiator, exhibited in the true Consecration of the Sceptic. By Frederick Aug. D. Tholuck, D. D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Halle. Translated from the German by Jonathan Edwards Ryland, with an Introductory Preface by John Pye Smith, D. D. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. pp. 238. 18mo.

² First Lines of Christian Theology, in the form of a Syllabus. Prepared for the use of the Students in the Old College, Homerton, with subsequent Additions and Elucidations, by John Pye Smith, D. D., LL. D., F. R. S., F. G. S., late Divinity Tutor in that Institution. Edited from the Author's Manuscripts, with Additional Notes and References, and Copious Indexes, by William Farrar, LL. D. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1854. pp. 744. 8vo.

prepare his volume for the press, he would probably have avoided some inconsistencies which now appear in various parts of the work, would have filled up some "*lacunae*," and thus have rendered his Syllabus more complete than it now is. He has done good service to the literature of theology, and we are happy to see the American edition of his suggestive theological System.

VI. TURNBULL'S CHRIST IN HISTORY.¹

"THE Gospel is the fulfilment of all hopes, the perfection of all philosophy, the interpreter of all revolutions, the key to all the seeming contradictions of the physical and moral worlds; it is life, it is immortality." This adage of John Von Müller is largely illustrated in the present volume. The volume "does not pretend to be a *philosophy* of history, or to be strictly a philosophical or scientific work. Its form, in fact, is rather popular than philosophical, though based upon fundamental principles, and aiming to elucidate and apply essential elements. The title 'Christ in History' limits its character to an exposition of the relations of Christ (here taken as the highest expression or manifestation of God) to universal history."

"Hence it takes the Incarnation as the central or 'turning point' in the history of mankind, and attempts to show how all the forces of society converge around it, how all preceding history prepares for it, how all succeeding history dates from it. In order to develop this fact, the reader is taken back to central facts and principles, in other words, to the fountains of history in the nature of God, and the nature of man; and the attempt is made to show that the history of the world, ancient and modern, can be understood only with reference to Christ. This is not assumed dogmatically, but evolved by an exposition of historical facts."

While perusing the volume of Dr. Turnbull, we are often reminded of the remark which he quotes from the *Stromata* of Clement: "If the truth be but one, however numerous the modes of error, we may suppose the different schools of philosophy, barbarian as well as Greek, seizing on it as the Bacchantes seized on Pentheus, and having torn it to pieces, each bearing off a part, and then boasting itself of possessing the whole. Yet I think the dawn of that light in the east illuminated them all; for it may be proved that all who sincerely sought after the truth, whether Greeks or barbarians, did in fact carry off, in some cases, not a little of the truth which they sought, the fragments of which being collected and reunited, the perfect Logos (Reason) or truth is then fully seen and known; for he who can with propriety be called a Christian philosopher, must be imbued with all knowledge."

The idea that Christ is the centre of history and of philosophy; that no scientific system is complete without the recognition of Him, and that all

¹ Christ in History, or, The Central Power among Men. By Robert Turnbull, D. D. Boston: Phillips, Sampson and Company. London: Sampson Low, Son and Company. 1854. pp. 540. 12mo.

history is an insoluble enigma unless explained by his redemptive act, has often been developed by the Christian writers of Europe, but in this country has not been so fully elucidated as in the present volume of Dr. Turnbull. The work is the fruit of extensive reading, and contains less of merely fanciful interpretation, than such works usually contain. The author has written on a theme which gives free play to the imagination. We are pleased to notice his full recognition of the fact, that man was made for belief in God and immortality, and that, even in the most degraded tribes, we may discover the tendencies of the mind to exercise a faith in some kind of divinity, and some phasis of a future existence.

VII. BOLTON'S EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.¹

It is a remark of Hundeshagen, that "the first age of the Christian church is rightly called the Apologetic, for the Christian religion had then to win its right to existence by its struggles. We of this age are in this respect carried back to the commencement of Christianity, for the fore front of the battle of parties relates to the very existence of the Christian religion. So that, without doubt, we are called upon to apply our Christian attainments to that same Apologetic task which engaged the attention of the first centuries." The design of the present essay is, to collect the replies which the early Apologists made to the objections of the infidels who were their contemporaries, and to arrange the various arguments adduced for the truth of Christianity by its earliest defenders. The essay discloses abundant evidence that most of the modern objections against the Bible are almost as old as the Bible itself; and that the reasonings of recent Apologists for Christianity have, in very many instances, been anticipated by the Fathers of the first four centuries. The volume arranges the testimonies of the early Christians with rare tact, and is a convenient thesaurus of information for the practical clergyman.

VIII. HOPPIN'S NOTES.²

THIS elegant volume is one result of a tour through Greece and Palestine, and of a residence somewhat protracted at the German Universities. It dispenses with the dry details of a tourist, and concentrates the reader's attention upon the focal points of interest in foreign travel. Its plan herein is original and happy. It is an *intellectual* volume, and throughout breathes an eminently Christian spirit. Its Chapters are on the University of Frederic William, the Home of Luther, Augsburg, the Country Church, Schil-

¹ The Evidences of Christianity, as exhibited in the Writings of its Apologists down to Augustine. Hulsean Prize Essay. By W. J. Bolton, Professor in Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1854. pp. 302. 12mo.

² Notes of a Theological Student. By James Mason Hoppin. New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1854. pp. 256. 12mo.

ler's Cottage, the Hartz, German Music, Delphi, Parnassus, the Greek Ideal, Athens, the Religion of Islam, Bethlehem, Nazareth, Capernaum, the Two Gardens, the Study of the Bible. The style and entire conception of the volume give promise that the author will adorn the profession to which he has consecrated his life.

IX. THOMPSON'S EGYPT.¹

A man of letters can enjoy but few richer privileges than that of visiting the Nile and the plains which it fertilizes. It was in the spirit of a scholar that Mr. Thompson roamed over Alexandria and Thebes, and walked around Memnon which Homer and Herodotus and Plato and Strabo had gazed upon with wonder. He describes the cities and the scenes of Egypt with a graphic pencil. Their history is familiar to him, and he makes it *live* in the minds of his readers. But it is preëminently as a *Christian* scholar, that Mr. Thompson engages the attention of his clerical readers. A fresh interest in the Old Testament, a new admiration for the spirit of Christianity is imparted by his descriptions of the land so intimately associated with the people of the Covenant, and with the Fathers of the Church. His volume is a happy exemplification of the literary and the religious spirit combined. He knows what needs to be illustrated; he detects the comparative importance of the Egyptian scenes for the scholar and theologian; and has thus given to clergymen, as well as to instructed laymen, an agreeable commentary on many difficult passages of sacred and profane history.

X. THE SPIRIT'S SWORD.²

In this little volume the great question of the plenary authority of the Bible, as a Divine revelation from God, is discussed in a clear and forcible manner for the popular mind. The question is raised at the outset: How are we to regard the claim of this Book? Shall we honor it only as a relic of past ages, or shall we yield our lives and hearts to its authority? In answering this question the author considers the various arguments from presumptive evidence, from prophecy, from the works of God, and from experience, meeting and setting aside, as he proceeds, the objections of scepticism. He everywhere plants himself on the broad and solid ground of conscience, common sense, and unperverted reason, which constitute everywhere and always the best defence against the assaults of infidelity. We regard this as a timely treatise, well adapted to the end which it professes to accomplish, and hope it may have an extensive circulation.

¹ *Photographic Views of Egypt, Past and Present*, by Joseph P. Thompson. Boston: Published by John P. Jewett and Company. Cleveland, Ohio: Jewett, Proctor and Worthington. 1854. pp. 458. 12mo.

² *The Spirit's Sword; or the Truth Defended from Errors and Popular Delusions*. By William Warren, author of "Household Consecration," etc. Boston: S. K. Whipple and Co., 100 Washington Street. 1853. 18mo. pp. 179.

XI. MEMOIR OF REV. OLIVER A. TAYLOR.¹

EVERY one has his own intellectual moods and habits of thought, and a moral character ingrafted upon, and more or less moulded by them. The whole man, thus shaped and informed, is adapted to exert a specific power in the social sphere. Every one has thus a definite value in the web of society, just as each strand of a net contributes its share to the strength of the whole. This peculiar intellectual and moral conformation is each one's own; it marks one out and distinguishes him from all others; it may differ from that of another no more than two seedlings in the gardener's nursery; yet it differs. This idiosyncrasy is the sovereign gift of our Creator, and constitutes every man's true value; the stamp on the coin. All that is incumbent on him is to invest it in the most profitable manner, so that when the Master comes, he may receive his own with usury. The share of honor due to any man, therefore, is proportioned to his efforts to impress his own sanctified individuality on the world. We do not well to inquire who has most intellectual power or the best kind of power, any more than what day of the season is most efficient in producing the golden fruits and abundant harvests of autumn, but simply who has wielded most earnestly his own power. So each one, performing the task assigned him, best secures his Maker's approbation, and so should receive most heartily our commendation. John Milton, Jonathan Edwards, Baxter, Cornelius, Chalmers, Stuart, Prof. Edwards, had each a certain mould of mind, certain proclivities and modes of activity; and each wrought out, by the workings of his own distinctive capacities, a peculiar influence. When alive, each presented to the world an intellectual and moral development, which operated as incitements to correspondent thoughts and feelings; working out kindred results on the minds of others; and, when dead, they are very properly held up as still powerful instrumentalities to widen and deepen the same channels of influence which they severally started while with us. A good fountain should always be kept open, and its healthful streams perpetually flowing.

Mr. Taylor differed from all and each of these eminent men, both in intellectuality and moral tendency; and yet these characteristics, inlaying and moulding each other, qualified him to set in motion wide streams of influence for the good of man. Though the coloring of his character was peculiarly his own, and might strike different minds differently, yet it had its value in heightening the beauty of the variegated woof of society. Why should it not still perform its distinctive work? It is, indeed, fitting that his memorial be written and his character preserved. The process of embalming it has been a fraternal task; and we are thankful that it is done, and well done.

¹ Memoir of Rev. Oliver A. Taylor, of Manchester, Massachusetts. With a Portrait. By Rev. Timothy Alden Taylor, author of "The Solace," "Zion," and "Zion's Pathway."

The most valuable legacy bequeathed us by Mr. Taylor, is the example of one gifted with uncommon abilities and lofty aspirations, born in poverty, struggling against the barriers of circumstances, overcoming insuperable obstacles, making, by dint of unwearied effort, extensive acquisitions in the fields of science, especially of sacred literature, and humbly consecrating all to his Master's service. The thirst which he early felt for a liberal education would not be satisfied without its object. His resolution in its pursuit never wavered, his perseverance never tired, his energy never forsook him. Patient, hopeful, undeterred in view of gigantic difficulties, he pressed forward with a lion's heart. The more he drank of the sweet waters of knowledge, the more intense his thirst became. To this fountain he went again and again, and ever with fresh delight, till he had power to go no more. We wish that his memorial might be read by all our youth, especially those in the process of a public education, or who are desirous of entering on such a course, and that they would imitate his indomitable purpose of large and thorough acquisitions in the fields of learning. With a lazy student we have no sympathy; a lazy Christian student we deem highly criminal. We would, also, that those looking forward to positions of public trust, especially in the church of God, would write, on their inmost souls, the phrase so often repeated by Mr. Taylor: "swallowed up in the glory of God;" would learn by experience all the richness of its import, arouse themselves to systematic and vigorous exertion, and lay their hard-earned treasures at the feet of Christ.

We think the memoir of Mr. Taylor cannot fail to take rank among our best religious biographies. We rejoice to see that it has already reached the second edition; an evidence that it is appreciated by the public. All Christians will find in its pages admonition and encouragement — food for spiritual life.

XII. BROWN'S HISTORY OF MISSIONS.¹

THE history of missions is full of interest to the Christian and philanthropist. It is a record of the efforts made to elevate the race; a record of the success of the Gospel, of its triumphs under signal discouragements, and sometimes of its failures. Such a history illustrates the adaptation of the Gospel to the human mind in all its varieties and phases, while, at the same time, it shows how strong an influence is needed to do away the ignorance, correct the superstitions, the prejudices and false reasonings of those who have lived without any of the influences of Christianity. It is the object of this work to give a faithful account of the more important missions established in different parts of the world since the Reformation. It does not invest the

¹ History of the Propagation of Christianity among the Heathen since the Reformation. By the Rev. William Brown, M. D. Third edition, brought down to the present time. In three volumes. 8vo. William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1854.

missionary work with an air of romance; it presents alike the successes and the failures; the hopes and the discouragements; the instances in which wise and comprehensive views have been adopted and successfully executed, and also those in which a mistaken policy has been attended with disappointment. The history of missions thus truthfully and impartially written, says the author, "might render missionary societies less popular, but they would probably be more useful. Fewer individuals might offer themselves as missionaries, but those who came forward would, it is likely, be more select. Less money might be raised, but less also would be spent by the employment of unsuitable agents. Besides, were more correct pictures drawn of the nature of the missionary work; were its difficulties and discouragements, its trials and disappointments, its imperfections and its failures, faithfully portrayed, we trust that the spirit of prayer would be awakened among Christians in another manner than it is at present." "Christians in general know but little of the difficulties, the trials and the temptations to which missionaries are exposed; and hence it cannot be expected that they should bear them in any suitable manner on their hearts before God in prayer. There is, in fact, an unhallowed confidence in that magnificent apparatus of means, which is at present in operation, as if it *must* produce a mighty change in the state of the world." (Preface.)

The second edition of this work was republished in this country, in 1816, in two volumes. Since that time, the author, who is at present Secretary of the Scottish Missionary Society, has devoted many years to collecting and arranging the materials for the present edition. He has had access to the best sources of information: to the reports and other publications of the respective missionary societies, and has shown excellent judgment in the use of his materials, laying before his readers the prominent facts in the history of the several missions, such as are of real and permanent value in illustrating missionary operations.

We know not where else to find, within the same compass, so much well-digested and reliable information on the subject of missions, as in these volumes. The study of them will inspire the reader with new views of the importance, responsibility, and dignity of the missionary work.

XIII. HUGH MILLER.¹

AT a time when Natural Science is in so many quarters displaying an unwonted arrogance and conceit, it is refreshing to hold intercourse with a devout and thoroughly earnest scientific spirit. Hugh Miller yields to no man in his enthusiasm in his own chosen department. This we had learned before. He was before very favorably known as an author; we have now

¹ *My Schools and Schoolmasters: or, the Story of my Education.* By Hugh Miller. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1854.

The Two Records: the Mosaic and the Geological; a Lecture, etc. By Hugh Miller. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1854.

become acquainted with him as a man. No one can read this autobiography without entertaining a profounder respect for him. Neither science nor the Bible will ever suffer at his hands. He finds God everywhere in science. And, while he steadily and earnestly demands respect for the legitimate results of scientific investigation, we are already favorably disposed to any new construction of disputed points in Biblical interpretation, that he may suggest.

We regard his lecture as proposing a very happy reconciliation of Genesis and Geology.

Besides, in the words of one of the honored associate editors of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (a countryman of Mr. Miller), the memoir "is curious as illustrating a phase of Scottish society, and modes of Scottish life, which have either wholly passed or are fast passing away."

We regret that the typography is less accurate than is common with the enterprising publishers.

ARTICLE VIII.

SELECT THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

GERMANY presents us but little this quarter that is of general interest. We shall hold the war responsible.

In the department of exegesis, we can name, for the Old Testament, only Baumgarten's "Night visions of Zechariah, a prophetic voice to the present age," Vol. I. (a work of practical rather than purely exegetical character); and a second edition of Ewald's Commentary on Job, being Part III. of his "Dichter des Alten Bundes."

Stier and Theile's Polyglot Bible has reached Part 5 of Vol. III.

More has been done for the interpretation and literary history of the New Testament; yet we find but little here. Of Düsterdieck's Commentary on the Epistles of John, Vol. II. Part 1, has lately appeared. Schneider (of Berlin) has published a treatise on "the Genuineness of John's Gospel, according to the external evidence." G. K. Mayer has also published a work on the same general subject.

Lekebusch's "Composition and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles" is very warmly commended.

An Exposition of the Epistle of Jude has appeared, from the pen of Dr. M. F. Rampf.

We notice, also, Hofmann's "Life of Christ according to the Apocrypha," and a treatise (which is well spoken of) by J. E. Meyer on "The relation of Christ and his disciples to the law of the Old Testament;" and from Ley-

den, a "Disputatio de locis evangelii Johannis in quibus ipse auctor verba Jesu interpretatus est," by E. Laurillard.

Ewald has published a treatise on "The Origin, Sense and Connections of the *Æthiopic Book of Enoch*."

Lindner's valuable Church History is completed by the publication of Part 2 of Vol. III.

We see that Hase's Church History has just reached a seventh edition, and Guericke's an eighth.

Daniel's Codex Liturgicus is complete. Vol. IV., the second part of which is just out, contains liturgies of the Greek church.

We would call attention, also, to a treatise by E. G. Müller, exhibiting the doctrine of Gregory of Nyssa on the nature of man, and comparing it with Origen's doctrine.

Julius Müller has just published a work on "The Evangelical Union, its nature and Divine right."

We find announced, further, Ledderhose's *Life of Myconius of Gotha*; Schwarz's "Lessing as a Theologian;" Helfert's "Huss and Hieronymus;" Abeken's Lecture on "The religious life in Islamism;" Dr. W. Hoffmann's, on "The Divine order in the Old Testament;" and Diettlin's "Lectures on Protestantism and Catholicism."

In the department of general history, we notice Vol. I. of Leo's "Lectures on the History of the German people and empire;" Kortüm's *History of Greece* (to the downfall of the *Achaean League*), in three volumes; and Vol. II. of Peter's *History of Rome* (to the overthrow of the Republic).

Vol. II. Part 1 of Hegel's "Views on Education and Instruction," edited by Thaulow, is just out; also Strümpell's "History of the Theoretical Philosophy of the Greeks."

Prof. Gerhard of Berlin has commenced a work on Greek Mythology; the first volume, which has lately appeared, has for its subject "The Greek Divinities."

Of Grässe's "Manual of Literary History," III. 2 and III. 3. 1 have just been published; and of Kayser's "Bücher-Lexicon (the Supplement) XI. 1 and 2.

Dillmann's *Grammatica Ægyptiaca* is in press.

Part II. of Weber's "White Yajurveda" is just out.

The new edition of Ritter's *Erdkunde* has reached Part 1 of Vol. XVII.

Humboldt's "Travels in America and Asia" is to be published in three volumes of six parts each. Vol. I. Part 1 has just been published.

The last two numbers of the "Studien und Kritiken" contain, among other articles, one by Thenius on "The testimony of the songs of degrees in the inquiry concerning the time of the composition of the Psalms," one by Lechler on "The Old Testament in the discourses of Jesus," one by Lipsius on "The design and occasion of the first epistle to the Thessalonians," one by Grimm (of Jena) on James 4: 5, 6, a criticism of Lücke's "Introduction to the Revelation of John," by Bleek, and one of Herzog's "Real-Encyclopädie" by Hagenbach.

FRANCE.

- WE have but a few items of French intelligence to communicate.

A work promising much to the classical and the Biblical scholar, as well as to the student of natural sciences, is now in course of publication at Paris. It is "*Asie mineure. Description statistique et archéologique de cette contrée, par P. de Tchibatchef. I. Partic. Géographie physique comparée Paris, 1853.*"

M. Eugene Hagg of Paris has recently discovered in the public library of Geneva the manuscript history of French Protestants in the various places to which they fled for refuge; a work composed about a century ago by Pastor Antoine Court. He was one of the most faithful and zealous friends of Protestantism in France during the reign of Louis XV., and died in 1781. In 1784, after the death of his son, the unedited manuscript of "*L'Histoire du Refuge,*" was lost sight of, and has only recently been discovered among other papers deposited at Geneva.

A valuable treatise lately published as a prize essay of the French Academy bears the title: "*Essai historique sur la société civile dans le monde Romain, et sur la transformation par le Christianisme.*" It is from Prof. Schmidt of Strasburg, and is of high value both to the theologian and to the classical scholar (pp. iv. 508).

A work somewhat kindred in its subject is entitled: "*Saint Paul et Senèque; Recherches sur les rapports du philosophe avec l'Apôtre, et sur l'infiltration du Christianisme naissant à travers le paganisme, par Amadée Fleury.*"

In the exegetical department, we notice the publication of Vol. I. of a new carefully revised edition of Calvin's Commentaries on the New Testament. This volume contains the Harmony of the Synoptical Gospels.

The Abbé Arnaud, professor at Brignoles, has published, in one volume: "*Essais de commentaires sur les Epîtres de S. Paul et de autres Apôtres.*"

Dr. F. Monnier has published a work entitled: "*Alcuin et son influence littéraire, religieuse et politique chez les Franks, avec des fragments d'un commentaire inédit d'Alcuin sur S. Matthieu, etc.*"

"The Chronological and Dogmatic History of the Christian Councils," by the Abbé André d'Avallon, has reached Vol. IV.; and Abbé Guettée's History of the Church of France, Vol. IX.

There seems to be of late a considerable development of literary activity in the various departments of theology among the Catholics of France, as well as elsewhere in Europe. This has become necessary in order that Catholicism may maintain itself at all in some of its old homes. Elsewhere, as in Germany, the struggle is for extension, and to secure new concessions.

ENGLAND.

THE sixth volume of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, which is just published, contains, among other articles, Sketches of Butler by Prof. Henry Rogers (author of the "Eclipse of Faith"), of Calvin and Channing by Dr. W. L. Alexander, of Campbell by Aytoun, and of Chalmers by Hanna. The article on Chemistry is furnished by Prof. Gregory of Edinburgh.

The new edition of Bunsen's *Hippolytus* is published. The general title of the work now is: "Christianity and Mankind, their Beginnings and Prospects." It consists of three parts: "Hippolytus and his Age," "Outlines of the Philosophy of Universal History," and "Analecta Antenicæna."

Vol. II. of the author's "Egypt's Place in Universal History," which was to appear about this time, is to contain the substance of Vols. II. and III. of the German edition, with emendations and additions.

The concluding volume of Finlay's *Byzantine History* has just appeared. It covers the period embraced between A. D. 1057—1453. This is to be followed by a *History of Greece under the Turkish, Venetian, revolutionary and Bavarian domination*, terminating with the establishment of the complete independence of Greece by the adoption of a representative government, Sept. 15th, 1843. Mr. Finlay will then have supplied us with a complete history of Greece from the end of her classical period.

The publication of Vol. II. of Dr. William Smith's *Dictionary of Geography* has commenced. The author is preparing an *Atlas of Classical Geography* to illustrate this work.

We see it announced that a new *Classical Atlas* is in preparation by Mr. George Long, who has been a valuable contributor to Dr. Smith's series of dictionaries.

Dr. Smith is now editing, with notes, for Mr. Murray, "Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." The fourth volume has just appeared. The notes and prefaces of Milman and Guizot are retained. Four more volumes are yet to appear.

The "*Bibliotheca Classica*" thus far comprises: Vol. I. Long's edition of Cicero against Verres; Vol. II. Horace, edited by Macleane; Vols. III. and IV. Blakeley's Herodotus.

As a companion to Smith's *School History of Greece*, Mr. Liddell is preparing a *School History of Rome*.

Merivale has lately edited in England, Abeken's "Account of the Life and Letters of Cicero."

There is in preparation, and to be published by Trübner in London, and Lippincott, Grambo and Co. in Philadelphia, a new *Latin-English Dictionary*, based on the *School Dictionary of Ingerslev*, with additions from the *Lexicons of Koch and Klotz*, and edited by George R. Crooks and A. J. Schem.

Among the more recent theological works we notice Maurice's "Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the first and second centuries;" Tregelles's "Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament;" Thomson's

Exposition of Acts; De Burgh's "The early Prophecies of a Redeemer" (a series of Lectures before the University of Dublin); Dr. Giles's "Christian Record and Historical Enquiry concerning the Age, Authorship and Authenticity of the New Testament;" Harvey's "History and Theology of the three Creeds;" C. Kingsley's "Alexandria and her Schools;" "Christianity, theoretical and practical," by William Kirkus; "Genuine Repentance and its Effects; an exposition of the fourteenth chapter of Hosea," by Rev. M. Margoliouth; Thomas Lewin's "Essay on the Chronology of the New Testament," and his "Life and Epistles of St. Paul, with some account of the latter days of St. Peter;" and W. Lee's "Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures."

Theodore's Ecclesiastical History has lately been edited by Gaisford, and Theophylact on Matthew by W. G. Humphry.

Messrs. T. and T. Clark have just published a "History of French Literature in the eighteenth century," by Prof. Vinet of Lausanne; Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu and others of their day are thoroughly discussed.

There is in press at Cambridge "The New Testament Canon during the first four centuries," by Westcott.

We see announced elsewhere, "The Epistle to the Hebrews compared with the Old Testament;" also "The Psalms, a new translation, with notes critical and explanatory," by the late Dr. John Mason Good, edited by Dr. Henderson.

An Autobiography of the late William Jay is in press, edited by Dr. Redford and John Angell James.

A new edition of "The Many Mansions in the House of the Father," by the late Rev. G. S. Faber, contains his memoir by Rev. F. A. Faber.

Curzon's "Armenia, a year at Erzurum, and on the frontiers of Russia, Turkey and Persia;" F. A. Neale's "Islamism, its Rise and Progress;" Ruskin's "Lectures on Architecture and Painting;" Sir Edmund Head's edition of Kugler's "Handbook of Painting;" Vol. IV. of Farini's History of Rome; Waagen's "Treasures of Art in Great Britain;" Cousin's Lectures on the Philosophy of Kant, and Darling's "Cyclopaedia Bibliographica," are all works of interest and value in their several departments.

Petermann's "Account of the Expedition to Central Africa under Richardson, Barth, Overweg and Vogel in the years 1850-3," contains the most accurate report yet given to the public concerning this important and perilous enterprise.

The Memoirs of the Life and Writings of James Montgomery, with Selections from his Correspondence and Conversations, by John Holland and James Everett, is soon to be published.

"The Memorials of the Life of Amelia Opie, selected and arranged from her Letters, Diaries, and other Manuscripts," in one volume, has appeared. The "Memorials" of this authoress, whose society was sought by Mackintosh, Walter Scott, Sheridan, Rogers, Humboldt, Sidney Smith, and many others of high literary distinction, will be read with interest and profit.

We have also from the English press the Memoirs of Joseph John Gurney,

with Selections from his Journal and Correspondence, in two volumes, 8v^o, edited by Joseph B. Braithwaite.

"A treatise on Greek Metres, with the Choral parts of Sophocles metrically arranged," is in preparation by Rev. W. Linwood.

The second number of the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* fully sustains the favorable estimate which we formed from an examination of the first number. The Articles in the second number are: The Sophists (controversing some of the views of Grote on this subject, in his *History of Greece*); Martyrdom and Commemorations of St. Hippolytus; Some special Difficulties in Pindar; Remarks on some of the Greek Tragic Fragments; Schneidewin's edition of the *Oedipus Rex*; Classical Authorities for Ancient Art; A point in the Doctrine of the Ancient Atomists, with short Notices, etc.

"*Siluria: the history of the oldest known rocks containing organic remains*," by Sir Roderick Murchison, is a valuable work recently published. The author has devoted many years to the investigations of this subject, and has given information of great value respecting the successive strata which contain "organic remains." No one of the geologists has made more elaborate and brilliant investigations. Previous to these, little was known in regard to the oldest sedimentary rocks, in which the earliest forms of vegetable and animal life have been found. These researches afford new material for establishing the "succession of life" and the "order in creation," as well as cogent arguments to refute the theory of "transmutation" or "development." The volume contains a colored map, thirty-eight plates, and two hundred wood-cuts.

The claim of M. de Sauley, in his "*Journey round the Dead Sea*," etc., of having discovered the five condemned Cities of the Plain, Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim and Zoar, meets with little favor in the foreign Journals; a few have conceded his claims, but most reject them. Chevalier Van de Velde, late Lt. of the Dutch Royal Navy, in 1851 and 1852 visited, upon the southern shores of the Dead Sea, the sites where M. de Sauley supposed he had made his chief discovery, and he pronounces what he found there to be anything but ruins. The views of Chevalier Van de Velde on this subject may be found in his "*Narrative of a Journey through Syria and Palestine*," noticed under our intelligence from Scotland.

SCOTLAND.

THE summer quarter is usually a slack time with publishers, especially such as deal in works of solid literature. The war, also, in which Great Britain is at present engaged, has begun to tell unfavorably on the publishing trade; partly from the great rise in the price of paper, owing to the stoppage of a large supply of materials for the manufacture of that article, which used to come from Russia; partly from the excitement of the public mind, turning people away from the reading of solid books; and partly from there being less money in the pockets of the people, owing to the increased taxation and

the high price of the first necessities of life. All these influences combine to induce publishers to hold back, and defer the bringing out of large books till a more favorable season. Hence few works of any note have appeared in Scotland since last quarter.

The publication of Dugald Stewart's Works, edited by Sir W. Hamilton, has commenced; the first volume containing the Dissertation on the Progress of Metaphysical and Ethical Philosophy having been published. It is most carefully edited, and very attractive in its appearance.

A Narration of a Journey through Syria and Palestine in 1851 and 1852, by C. W. M. Van de Velde, has appeared in two volumes. It is in the form of letters, and is devoted chiefly to questions of Biblical Geography and Archaeology. The author seems to have kept the book of M. de Saulcy, on the Shores of the Dead Sea, constantly in view, and he very successfully refutes some of that ingenious but hasty writer's conclusions. There is much in the book that is interesting, but the style is too excited, and the tone of feeling which pervades the volumes borders on the fanatical.

The efforts of the Papists to spread their principles keep alive the controversy between them and the friends of evangelical truth and liberty. Passing over minor publications, two volumes of some importance have recently made their appearance in this department. These are: "The Mystery Unveiled: or Popery as its Dogmas and Pretensions appear in the light of Reason, the Bible and History," by the Rev. James Bell, one of the Ministers of Haddington; and "Popery as it exists in Great Britain and Ireland, its Doctrines, Practices and Arguments exhibited from the writings of its Advocates, and from its most popular books of Instruction and Devotion," by the Rev. James Montgomery, Free Church Minister at Innerleithen. The former of these works is of a philosophical cast; the author aims at an analysis of Popery into its generative principles as found in the present condition of man's fallen nature; and he shows with much acuteness and a great amount of research, how the mystery of iniquity in all its elements is traceable to man's dislike of a spiritual religion and worship, and his tendency to idolatry and formalism. Mr. Montgomery's book is more of a statistical and polemical character; it is full of authentic information respecting the actual condition of Popery in the British isles, and affords full and reliable elucidations of the real character and pretensions of that system.

Dr. Millar, Professor of Surgery in the University of Edinburgh, has recently published a small volume entitled "Physiology in Harmony with the Bible respecting the Sabbath," the object of which is to show that, by the constitution of our nature, a periodical rest, such as the weekly Sabbath provides, is essential to the healthy and vigorous exercise of the muscles and the brain, as well as for the prosperity of the soul.

A curious and instructive book has been published by the British government, giving a Report, with digested tables, of the state of religious worship and education in Scotland. From this it appears, that there are in that country 3,395 places of worship, with 1,834,805 sittings, and that the proportion of sittings to the population is 63.5 per cent. This shows a much

larger amount of church accommodation than in England, in which, with all its wealth, the proportion is only 57.0 per cent. The case is reversed in regard to Sabbath schools, the proportion for Scotland being 10.1 per cent. of the population, while that of England is 13.4.¹ The Established Church has the largest number of places of worship, viz. 1,183; the Free Church next, viz. 889; then the United Presbyterians, viz. 465; the united number belonging to all other sects being 858. The Congregationalists (Calvinistic and Arminian) have 168 places of worship with 58,847 sittings. W. L. A.

UNITED STATES.

DR. Laurens P. Hickok of Union College has recently given to the public a duodecimo volume of four hundred pages, entitled: *Empirical Psychology*; or, *The Human Mind as given in Consciousness*. Schenectady: Published by G. Y. Van Debogert. A clear view of the aim of this volume is given, especially to the readers of Dr. Hickok's *Rational Psychology*, in the following extract from the author's Preface: "It is the design, in the present work, to represent the human mind as it stands in the clear light of consciousness. We go to our own inward experience to find the facts, both of the single mental phenomena and of their connection with each other. An *Empirical Philosophy* is here alone attempted, and in which we cannot proceed according to the order of a *pure science*. The necessary and universal Ideas, which must determine all mental activity in every capacity, in order that these capacities may become intelligible to us in their conditional laws of operation, are not now first assumed, and then carried forward to a completed system by a rigid *a priori* analysis and deduction in pure thought. Such a work has already been accomplished in a *Psychology* thoroughly rational. The subjective Idea which must condition and expound all Intelligence has been attained, and then the objective Law which controls all the facts of an acting Intelligence has been determined to be in exact accordance. But in this work we wait upon experience altogether. We use no fact, and no combination of facts, except as they have already been attained in the common consciousness of humanity. It is rather a description of the human mind than a philosophy of it; a *psycography* rather than a *psychology*; and should not assume for itself the prerogatives of an exact science."

Dr. Francis Wayland, President of Brown University, has written a duodecimo volume, entitled: *The Elements of Intellectual Philosophy*, which will soon be published by Gould and Lincoln, Boston. For many years Dr. Wayland has been Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in Brown University, and the present volume, like that of Dr. Hickok, is the result of personal experience in teaching the science.

Rev. Abiel Abbot Livermore, a celebrated Unitarian divine, has given to

¹ As religion is taught usually in the ordinary day schools in Scotland, Sabbath schools are less needed there than in England, which doubtless accounts for the fact above stated.

the press a volume entitled: *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans; with a Commentary and Revised Translation and Introductory Essays.* The following are the Contents of the volume: Essay I. The Bible, Inspired and Inspiring. Essay II. The Epistles of the New Testament. Essay III. The Apostle Paul. Essay IV. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. Essay V. The Epistle to the Romans, received version, with Commentary. Essay VI. A Revised Translation of the Epistle to the Romans.

Rev. Leicester A. Sawyer has recently written a volume entitled: *Organic Christianity; or, The Church of God, with its Officers and Government, and its Divisions and Variations, both in Ancient, Mediaeval and Modern Times. Embracing a Thorough Exposition and Defence of Church Democracy.* Boston: Published by John P. Jewett and Company. Cleveland, Ohio: Jewett, Proctor and Worthington. New York: Sheldon, Lamport and Blakeman. The work is divided into the four following Parts: I. The Polity of the Christian Church under Christ and the Apostles. II. The Post-Apostolic Church; or the Church after the Apostles, from A. D. 100 till 606. III. The Patriarchal and Papal Churches. IV. Revolutionary Churches. The Fourth Part contains the seven following Divisions: I. The Lutheran Church. II. The Church of England. III. The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. IV. The Methodist Episcopal Churches. V. The Presbyterian Churches. VI. The Congregational Churches. VII. Minor Denominations.

The American missionaries to the Nestorians have now published the *Old Testament in the Ancient and Modern Syriac.* It forms an imperial quarto of 1051 pages. It is printed in parallel columns; one being the old Peschito Version, and the other a Translation from the Hebrew. It was printed at Orûmiah, with type prepared at Orûmiah, by Mr. E. Breath, Missionary Printer. The whole Bible is now given to the Nestorians, in their vernacular language reduced to writing, by their missionaries. The *New Testament* is printed in the same style with the Old, and forms a quarto of 829 pages. Both the volumes are a monument to the worth of the admirable scholars engaged in the Nestorian mission, and to the literary as well as religious value of the missionary enterprise in general.

An interesting 18mo. work of 132 pages has just been published by Gould and Lincoln, entitled: *A Parisian Pastor's Glance at America.* By Rev. J. H. Grand Pierre, D. D., Pastor of the Reformed Church, and Director of the Missionary Institution in Paris. The following is its attractive table of contents: Chap. I. Visit to an Indian Village. II. Schools and Colleges. III. Theological Faculties. IV. Churches. V. Religious and Benevolent Societies. VI. Various Facts and Observations. VII. More Observations, and Various Facts. VIII. Conclusion.

For some time past we have been intending to notice a very interesting work, entitled: *On Civil Liberty and Self-Government,* by Francis Lieber, LL. D., C. M. French Institute, etc. In two volumes. Philadelphia: Lipincott, Grambo and Co. 1853. Our limits compel us to defer a review of this work until a future period. Meanwhile we append an imperfect cata-

logue of the books and pamphlets already published by the learned author of the volume just named. His German publications, as his *Journal in Greece*, his *Poems*, etc., we do not include in the present list, nor all of his American works: *Encyclopedia Americana*. — *On the Penitentiary System*. Carey and Lea, 1833. — *Stranger in America* (English title), or *Letters to Gentlemen* (American title). London, 1835. Philadelphia, 1834. — *Reminiscences of an Intercourse with Niebuhr*. London, 1835. Philadelphia, 1835. — *Constitution and Plan of Education for Girard College*, written by the appointment and published by the trustees. Philadelphia, 1834. — *A Popular Essay on Subjects of Penal Law and on Uninterrupted Solitary Confinement at Labor*, by order of the Philadelphia Prison Society, 1838. — *Great Events, described by Great Historians*. New York, 1840. — *Legal and Political Hermeneutics*. Boston, 1839. — *Letter to his Excellency Patrick Noble, Governor of South Carolina, on the Penitentiary System*, printed by order of the House of Representatives, 1839. — *On International Copyright*. Wiley and Putnam, New York, 1840. — *Essays on Labor and Property, as connected with Natural Law and the Constitution of Society*. Harpers, 1841. — *Political Ethics*. Two volumes. — *Remarks on the Relation between Education and Crime*. Printed by the Philadelphia Prison Society, 1835. — *On History and Political Economy, as necessary branches of Superior Education in Free States*. Inaugural Address, 1835. — *The Character of the Gentleman*. Charleston, S. C., Allen McCarl, 1837. — *A Dictionary of Latin Synonymes*. Little and Brown, Boston, 1839. — *Essay on the Study of Ancient Languages, as a necessary means of cultivating the mind in a superior education*, 1839. — *Vocal Sounds of Laura Bridgman, compared with the Origin of Phonetic Language*. Smithsonian Paper. — *Lecture on the Origin and Development of the first Constituents of Civilization*, 1845. — *Preface to the Translation of Bastiat's Popular Errors in Political Economy*, by Mrs. McCord. Putnam, 1848. — *On the Post Office*. — *On Civil Liberty and Self-Government*.

Messrs. Little, Brown and Company have published, in two volumes, 8vo, the "Works of Fisher Ames, with a Selection from his Speeches and Correspondence. Edited by his son." A collection of Mr. Ames's Works, in one volume, accompanied by a brief Memoir, was published in 1809. It is gratifying to see this new monument to one of the eminent men of our country.

The fourth Part of Schoolcraft's *History of the Indian Tribes of the United States* has appeared. It contains forty-one steel engravings. Though this work is attended with great expense, and on that account has given occasion to some complaint, it is an honor to our government and our country.

"The Belief of the first three centuries concerning Christ's Mission to the Underworld, by Frederic Huidekoper," has just been published by Messrs. Crosby, Nichols and Company, Boston, 12mo. pp. 187. The Underworld Mission was a very prominent subject among the early Christians, but has been almost entirely neglected by the principal writers on Ecclesiastical History. The work shows careful research, and the views of the early Christians are brought together in this little volume in a concise and conve-

nient form. The author's chief object in writing the book is an incidental argument for the genuineness of the Gospels in opposition to those who hold that these did not exist, in their present form, till the close of the second or beginning of the third century, and that they were either fabricated by the early Christians, or prepared to meet their views. If such were the case, is it reasonable to suppose that they would have omitted from these Gospels so prominent an article in their belief as the mission of Christ to the lower world is known to have been? The inference is, that the Gospels were not the work of the early Christians.

We have from the press of Messrs. Farmer, Brace and Company, New York, "Human Physiology, designed for Colleges and higher classes in Schools, and for general reading," in one volume, 12mo. pp. 389. By Prof. Worthington Hooker, M. D., of Yale College. This new work on Physiology evinces the growing interest in this department of study. It is free from most of the technicalities often found in similar works; it gives just and reliable views of the subject of which it treats, and is well adapted to make the study pleasant and profitable.

A new edition of the Writings of the elder President Edwards is now in course of preparation for the press. The edition published by the late Dr. Sereno Edwards Dwight cannot now be obtained at the bookstores, and the other editions of President Edwards's Works are too imperfect to satisfy the thorough student. The new edition will contain all that has been heretofore published of the President's writings, and also any new matter from his mss. which the editors may deem suitable for the press. All that he gave to the public during his life, will be printed in the new edition precisely as he left it; his own editions, of course, being the standard. For all that has been published *since* his death, the *original* editions will be the standard; and no changes will be made except in those instances in which important variations may be found in the mss. In all hitherto unpublished materials, the mss. will be rigidly followed. All the mss. left by the President will be carefully examined, and it is hoped that the new edition will contain all which the admirers of the author will desire to see, and nothing which they will deem unworthy of publication. We hope that this enterprise will stimulate the friends of other eminent divines who have left important contributions to theological science, to prepare these contributions for the press. We need uniform editions of our American treatises on ethics and divinity. The history of our literature demands them. A complete edition of the works of Dr. Dwight we should be happy to see made accessible to our students.

INDEX.

A.

Aiken, Charles A., Articles by, 67, 568.

Alexander's Connection of the Old and New Testaments, noticed, 626; Christ and Christianity, noticed, 628.

Alford's Greek Testament, noticed, 839.

Anselm on the Incarnation and Atonement, translated by J. G. Vose, 729; introductory notice of Anselm, 729; Anselm's preface, 735; question on which the work rests, 736; how what is said should be received, 737; objections of infidels; why the answers not decisive to infidels, 739; redemption not effected by other than God, 740; the devil no justice on his side, 742; further objections of infidels, 744; Christ died of His own accord, 746; further explanations, 749; sin and satisfaction for it, 752; payment of the debt necessary, 753; creature takes away honor due Creator; God honored in punishment of the wicked, 755; whether God's honor is violated, 756; number of fallen angels made up from men, 757; other angels cannot take the place of those fallen, 758; whether are more holy men than evil angels, 759; man not saved without satisfaction for sin, 765; satisfaction proportioned to guilt, 767; sin a great burden, 769; man, conquered by the devil, brought disgrace on God, 770; what man took from God by sin, 771;

man unhappy, not restoring what he owes God, 772; man's salvation by Christ necessarily possible, 774.

Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament, why excluded, by Prof. C. E. Stowe, 278; their names, 278; debates and decisions in Council of Trent, 280; never had sanction of Christ or Apostles, 292; no part of original Hebrew Canon, 293; rejected unanimously by the early churches and Church Fathers, 295.

B.

Ba'albek and Hums, Tour from Damascus to, by Rev. J. L. Porter, 649.

Barnes on Daniel, noticed, 629.

Barrows, Prof. E. P., Articles by, 806, 698.

Benecke on Romans, noticed, 841.

Biblical Science, Comparative value of English and German, by Charles A. Aiken, 67; development more rapid in Germany, 68; prosecuted there most scientifically; composition and history of sacred Canon, 69; form of sacred text, 71; meaning of the text, 73; modified by historical connections, 74; by circumstances of writing, 75; aid of archaeology, 76; "analogy of faith," 78; the human element often disregarded, 78; or over estimated, 79; influence of philosophy, 80; English exhibit profounder reverence, 81; rebuke mere theorizing, 82; use practical sense, 83; Ger-

- man science more stimulating and suggestive, 84; summary, neither decidedly superior; tribute to Prof. Edwards, 86.
- Boise, Prof. J. R.*, Article by, 167.
- Bolton, Rev. W. J.*, Evidences of Christianity, noticed, 844.
- Brown, Rev. William*, History of Missions, noticed, 847.
- C.
- Cannon's Pastoral Theology*, noticed, by Rev. C. Van Santvoord, 417.
- Capernaum*, our Saviour's Discourse in the Synagogue at, by Prof. E. P. Barrows, 698; Christ's person and office, 694; true view harmonizes Scripture, 695; satisfies wants of soul, 696; regards Him as Divine Redeemer, 704; exposition of the discourse, 709—729.
- Case, M. P.*, Article by, 394.
- Caste in Ceylon*, by Rev. B. C. Meigs, D. Poor, D. D., and Rev. W. W. Holland, 470; what it is, 470; what in Jaffna, 473; breaking caste, 475; what Hindûs are doing for its destruction; new caste introduced; constantly rising from higher to lower caste, 478; different methods of doing this, 479; how English are destroying it; miscellaneous remarks on the general subject, 480; how treated in churches, 484; observances of caste, 484—487; why treatment different from continent, 488.
- Chalybaeus's History of Philosophy*, noticed, 635.
- Chaucer and his Times*, by M. P. Case, 394.
- Christ as made known to the Ancient Church*, by Dr. Gordon, noticed, 631.
- Christian Character a Power in the World's Redemption*, by Prof. Austin Phelps, 490; text, Ps. 51: 12, 13; success of sanctifying enlarges range of regenerating power, 491; what the result of increase in energy of Christian character? the development of latent resources, 492; removal of existing hindrances, 498; concentration of moral power of church, 508; dignity of the pastoral office, 511.
- Citations of the Old Testament in the New*, translated by C. A. Aiken, 568; historical introduction, 569; citations in Jewish authors, 577; application of Old Testament in discourses of Christ, 586; application by Paul, 594; by Evangelists, 600; in Epistle to Hebrews, 606.
- Cockrane, Rev. S. D.*, Article by, 254.
- Coleman's Historical Text-book and Biblical Atlas*, noticed, 633.
- Comparative Philology*, Curtius's, noticed, 836.
- Conflict of Ages*, by Dr. E. Beecher, noticed, 186.
- D.
- Damascus*, Excursion to Lakes east of, by Rev. J. L. Porter, 329; excursion from to Yabrûd, 433.
- De Vere's Comparative Philology*, noticed, 200.
- Dodd, Rev. E. M.*, Article by, 830.
- Druidism*, by Rev. E. D. Morris, 456; Druids men of learning, 459; a political body, 460; a religious organization; doctrines, 461; rites and ceremonies, 463; temples and altars, 464; their great influence, 467; great evils from the system, 468; relation to present time, 469.
- E.
- Eadie on Ephesians*, noticed, 630.
- Ebrard on Hebrews*, noticed, 624.
- Educational System of Michigan*, by Prof. Boise, 167.
- G.
- Gardiner, Rev. F.*, Article by, 114.
- Genius of Hebrew and Roman Learning*, by Prof. P. B. Spear, 527.
- H.
- Hengstenberg on the Lord's Day*, noticed, 191.
- Hermion*, Excursion to the Summit of, by Rev. J. L. Porter, 41.
- Hickok, Dr. L. P.*, Article by, 1; Moral Science, noticed, 183.
- Historical Geography and Ethnography*, translated by E. C. Tracy, 217; man and nature, 217; man in his idea, 221; man fallen, 222; origin of races, 225; gradual degeneration, 226; providential movements

subsequent to the deluge, 227; location of races, 230; the Shemites, 236; Japhethites, 239; Hamites, 244; the nations as a whole, 245; history, 246; redemption, 249.

Historic Spirit, The, its Nature and Influence, by Prof. W. G. T. Shedd, 345; the field immense; difficulties of brief survey, 345; historic spirit defined; history and biography distinguished, 346; history, the story of the race; continuous; complete, 347; as actually written, imperfect, 349; the exhibition of the species, 350; influence of the historic spirit, 351; historic mind reverent and vigilant; productive and original, 352; unites moderation and enthusiasm, 359; in doctrinal church history, historic spirit promotes Scripturalism, 372; induces correct estimate of creeds, 376; they contain the philosophy of Christianity, 379; are marks of progress in theology, 382; protects from false notions of visible church, 386; promotes agreement in essentials, 389; the great ability needed, ability to differ generally, 391.

Hutchcock, Dr. E., Article by, 776.

Holland, Rev. W. W., Article by, 470.

Hoppin, Rev. J. M., Notes of a Theological Student, noticed, 844.

Horner, Francis, M. P., Memoirs of, noticed, 198.

Hughes's Outlines of Scripture Geography and History, noticed, 634.

I.

Intelligence, Literary and Theological, France, 851; Germany, 206, 640, 849; Great Britain, 211, 429, 643, 852; Greece, 637; United States, 213, 856.

J.

Jude and Second Peter, Similarity between, by Rev. F. Gardiner, 114; no reliable historical evidence of priority of either, 115; comparison of passages, 116—119; *prima facie* evidence in favor of Jude's priority; second Peter addressed to same as first, 121; Jude not one of the twelve, 122; object and design of the two epistles the same, 122;

have same plan of argument, 123; differences noticed, 125; general arrangement same; similarity in words and phrases, 129—137; Jude's skill in invention, Peter's in composition, 137; uses of considering Jude prior, 138.

K.

Köster, Dr. F., translation from, 514.

M.

Macedonia, Notes on its Geography, by Rev. E. M. Dodd, 830.

Man and his Food, by Dr. L. Withington, 139.

Meigs, Rev. B. C., Article by, 470.

Michigan, its Educational System, by Prof. Boise, 167.

Miller, Hugh, works, noticed, 848.

Moral Government of God over Moral Agents, by Rev. S. D. Cochrane, 254; all belief in positive moral government sometimes repudiated, 255; if so, God has no proper moral government, 256; is utterly incongruous with benevolence of God, 258; God cannot be just, 266; the atonement impossible, 271; can be no pardon or forgiveness; the doctrine demoralizing, 272; has no basis in word of God, 273.

Morris, Rev. E. D., Article by, 456.

P.

Paganized Ecclesiasticism, the chief Antagonist of the Modern Missionary, by Rev. J. P. Thompson, 801; Antioch the historic centre of missions, 801; heathenism has entered the form of Christianity, 803; Paul's entrance to Rome, 804; Rome crowded with symbols of idolatry, 806; a few Christians there, 807; Paul a prisoner, 808; Rome now; forum; arch of Titus, 809; Colosseum; kissing the cross; St. Peter's, 810; Sistine chapel; vespers, 811; the Pope, 812; Christmas; Virgin Mary vs. Diana, 814; Peter vs. Jupiter; homage to supreme Pontiff, 815; the Bambino, 817; Sabbath in Rome, 818; Paul in Rome now, 819; Athens, 820; modern and ancient compared, 821; Jerusalem, 822; causes of the change; church

- no longer simple brotherhood, 823; early Christian church, 824; progress of Papal power, 825; unity of the Papacy, 826; false theology; substitution of ceremonial for spiritual, 827; the Romanist an idolater, 828; how the missionary is to convert him, 829; the end near, 830.
- Paul*, was his Language modelled after Demosthenes? translated from the German of Dr. F. Köster, 514; Paul's mental training, 514; the material of his language Judaic, its form Greek, 515; rhetorical similarity to Demosthenes, 517; parallelisms in Romans, 518; first and second Corinthians, 520; Galatians, 521; Ephesians, 523; Colossians, first Thessalonians, first Timothy, 524; Titus, 525; Paul's inspiration undoubted, 526.
- Pauly, Prof. A.*, Encyclopaedia, noticed, 205.
- Phelps, Prof. A.*, Article by, 490.
- Phrenology*, by Dr. Pond [concluded from Vol. X. p. 672], 19; additional objections to it; the name; properly craniology, 19; teaches nothing new, 20; Mr. Combe reviewed, 21; effect of the science on education reprobated, 22; Mr. Levison and Blackburn reviewed, 23; the science has a dangerous moral tendency; to materialism, 24; classes of materialistic phrenologists, 25; tends to fatalism, 26; its views of nature of crime and desert of punishment, 28; transgressor a patient or lunatic, 30; influence of such notions on prison discipline, 31; on marriage, 32; religious bearings of the subject; phrenology tends to materialism, denies existence of the will, makes sin a misfortune, 33; conflicts with Bible, 34; in doctrine that selfishness is sin, that man is naturally and entirely sinful, that great moral change is necessary, 35; that the preaching of the Gospel is the great means of saving men, 37; that the Gospel is adapted to all; that prayer has efficacy, 38; that soul is intelligent while body is in the grave, 39.
- Pond, Dr. Enoch*, Article by, 19.
- Poor, Dr. Daniel*, Article by, 470.
- Porter, Rev. J. L.*, Articles by, 41, 329, 483, 649.
- R.**
- Relation of David's Family to the Messiah*, by Prof. E. P. Barrows, 306; relation existed by pure act of Divine sovereignty, 306; its interior nature, 309; nature of David's and Christ's kingdom; primary element of David's; the visible church of God, 314; Christ the head of visible church, 316; church of the Old Testament identical with New, 319; Christ the successor of David, 321; interpretation of Messianic prophecies, 322; two methods, 324; how David is a true type of Christ, 326; advantages of this view, 327.
- Rhetoric Determined and Applied*, by L. P. Hickok, D. D., 1; what the force which is the life of eloquence, 2; address, discourse modified by intention to communicate, 5; eloquence living address; rhetoric observing and studying eloquence as a subject, 6; it excludes philosophy, poetry, fine art, 7; eloquence reluctant all reading, 8; rhetoric applied, its apprehension reached only through analysis, 9; this analysis to be of the human susceptibilities, 10; the animal nature, 11; the moral nature, 12; results of sacred rhetoric rightly applied, 14; a distinct aim, thought, 15; unity, earnestness, 16; naturalness, appropriateness, 17.
- S.**
- Schmitz's Advanced Latin Exercises*, noticed, 636.
- Septem contra Thebas*, new edition, noticed, 616.
- Shedd, Prof. W. G. T.*, Article by, 345.
- Smith, Dr. John Pye*, Theology, noticed, 842.
- Spear, Prof. P. B.*, Article by, 527.
- Special Divine Interpositions in Nature*, by Dr. E. Hitchcock, 776; subject stated and defined; miracles, 777; special providences, 778; the doctrine illustrated, 779; ob-

- jections, 781; summary, 783; several distinct economies of life, 785; causes operating anterior to man's existence, 785; coal beds, 786; minerals; miraculous interpositions, 787; internal fires, 788; introduction of organic life, 789; doctrine of progression, 791; creation of man, 793; God of nature and revelation the same, 797.
- Stearns, William A., D. D.*, Article by, 155.
- Stowe, Prof. C. E.*, Article by, 278.
- Sweetser, Seth, D. D.*, Article by, 87.
- T.
- Taylor, Rev. Oliver A.*, Memoir of, noticed, 846.
- Temptation in the Wilderness*, The, by Dr. Stearns, 155; the circumstances; time, 155; nature of the fasting; scene of temptation, 156; how Jesus came there; how can a perfectly holy being be tempted? 157; by whom tempted, 159; general explanation, 160; adaptation of temptations to their object, 164; their representative character, 165; Christ's manner of resistance to be imitated, 165; rewards of temptation vanquished; order of temptations, 166.
- Tholuck's Sin and the Propitiator*, noticed, 842.
- Thompson, Rev. J. P.*, Article by, 801; Egypt, noticed, 845.
- Tischendorf's Apocryphal Gospels*, noticed, 194.
- Tracy, E. C.*, Article by, 217.
- Turnbull, Rev. R., D. D.*, Christ and History, noticed, 843.
- Tyler, Prof. W. S.*, Editions of Tacitus, noticed, 204.
- V.
- Van Santvoord, Rev. C.*, Article by, 417.
- Venema's Theology*, noticed, 195.
- Views of Truth peculiar to Christianity*, by Dr. S. Sweetser, 87; truths peculiar to revelation, 87; notices concerning God, 88; relations to God, 89; immortality of the soul, 91; resurrection of dead; moral knowledge of Pagan world and teachings of Bible correspond remarkably, 92; germs of truth, written revelation unknown, 93; New Testament, how distinct from the Old, 94; Trinity distinctive doctrine of New Testament, 97; unity of Son with Father, 99; Holy Ghost, Paraclete, 101; offices of Christ and Holy Ghost in redemption, 105; development of religion in disciples more definite, stronger and purer, 110; New Testament adapts itself to growth of human intellect, 113.
- Voe, J. G.*, Article by, 729.
- W.
- Warren, Rev. William*, The Spirit's Sword, noticed, 845.
- Wilmington, Leonard, D. D.*, Article by, 189.

ERRATA.

Page 531, line 21, for German read *Greek*.—P. 540, l. 34, for fruit read *print*.—P. 543, l. 18, after "from the earth," add *and crowned as if with Horeb's brow*.—P. 545, l. 36, after Plantus, add *with his facetiousness and wit; a Terence*.—P. 558, l. 10, for Greeks read *Gauls*.—P. 564, last line, read as follows, with a period after "ruin." As the *STATOR*, the stay of the young Roman State, he had once interposed his aid.

